NOTE

This Microfiche meets the quality requirements of the American National Standard for Microfiche of Documents (ANSI PH5.9-1975). However, because of imperfections in the document from which it was made, it contains images that are illegible or difficult to read. The source document for this microfiche is the best copy that could be obtained prior to filming.

CIS Congressional Information Service, Inc
Washington, D C

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE HELSINKI ACCORDS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SOVIET-AMERICAN EXCHANGES

NOVEMBER 17, 1987

Printed for the use of the
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

[CSCE 100-1-19]

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

81-078 WASHINGTON : 1988

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington, DC 20402

J891-2

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE

STENY H. HOYER, Maryland, *Chairman*
DENNIS DeCONCINI, Arizona, *Cochairman*

DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
EDWARD J. MARKEY, Massachusetts
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
EDWARD FEIGHAN, Ohio
DON RITTER, Pennsylvania
CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
JACK F. KEMP, New York
JOHN EDWARD PORTER, Illinois
FRANK LAUTENBERG, New Jersey
TIMOTHY WIRTH, Colorado
WYCHE FOWLER, Georgia
HARRY REID, Nevada
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO, New York
JOHN HEINZ, Pennsylvania
JAMES McCLURE, Idaho
MALCOLM WALLOP, Wyoming

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

HON. RICHARD SCHIFTER, Department of State
Vacancy, Department of Defense
Vacancy, Department of Commerce

SAMUEL G. WISE, *Staff Director*
MARY SUE HAFNER, *Deputy Staff Director and General Counsel*
JANE S. FISHER, *Senior Staff Consultant*
MIKE AMITAY, *Staff Assistant*
CATHERINE COSMAN, *Staff Assistant*
OREST DEYCHAKIWSKY, *Staff Assistant*
JOSH DOROSIN, *Staff Assistant*
JOHN FINERTY, *Staff Assistant*
ROBERT HAND, *Staff Assistant*
GINA M. HARNER, *Administrative Assistant*
JUDY INGRAM, *Staff Assistant*
JESSE JACOBS, *Staff Assistant*
JUDI KERNS, *Office Manager*
RONALD McNAMARA, *Staff Assistant*
MIKE OCHS, *Staff Assistant*
SPENCER OLIVER, *Consultant*
ERIKA SCHLAGER, *Staff Assistant*
LEONARD STEINHORN, *Press Officer*
THOMAS WARNER, *Printing Clerk*

CONTENTS

WITNESSES

NOVEMBER 17, 1987

	Page
Rhinesmith, Stephen, coordinator of the President's United States-Soviet Exchange Initiative	7
Tsypkin, Mikhail, former Salvatori Fellow in Soviet Studies at the Heritage Foundation and now assistant professor and coordinator of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, CA	12
Stone, Jeremy, Director of the Federation of American Scientists	37

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Responses by Mr. Walter Raymond, Jr., Assistant Director, U.S. Information Agency, replying on Stephen H. Rhinesmith's behalf to questions submitted by Chairman Steny Hoyer and Commissioner Chris Smith	66
Appendix 2: Materials submitted by Ark Communications Institute	84
Appendix 3: Testimony submitted by Majorie S. Schkolnick	108

PUBLIC HEARING: SOVIET-AMERICAN EXCHANGES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1987

COMMISSION ON SECURITY AND COOPERATION IN EUROPE,
Washington, DC.

The Commission met, pursuant to notice, in room 210 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC, at 10 a.m., Representative Steny H. Hoyer (chairman) and Senator Dennis DeConcini (cochairman) presiding.

In attendance from the Commission: Representative Christopher H. Smith; also participating Representative Morris K. Udall.

Also in attendance: Mary Sue Hafner, deputy staff director and general counsel; Jane S. Fisher, senior staff consultant; Jesse Jacobs, staff assistant; and Erika Schlager, staff assistant.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN HOYER

Chairman HOYER. Let's get started. We hope that other members of the Commission will get here.

Senator DeConcini I understand is on his way, but it is now almost 10:15, and I want to get started. Hopefully, he will be here before too long.

The Commissioners are well represented here, gentlemen, by their chief staff people dealing with the Helsinki issues, so that all the views that are going to be expressed here I'm sure will not only be read by the Commissioners but will be translated to them by their staff. Hopefully, we will have other members come in as we proceed.

Today the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe begins a series of hearings on the state of U.S. exchange programs with the Soviet Union. Today's hearing will examine the benefits and problems posed by United States-Soviet exchange programs. Future Commission hearings will focus on more specific programs, including cultural, educational and scientific exchanges.

Exchange agreements have been a part of United States-Soviet relations since the days of the Eisenhower administration. Their goal has been to build bridges of understanding and to open the closed societies of the East to real openness of the West.

Most recently, in November 1985, a program of cooperation exchanges were signed by President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev in Geneva. That agreement extends certain exchange programs through 1988, and beyond.

I'm very pleased to note the presence of one of our most distinguished and senior Members of the Congress, chairman of the Interior Committee, a gentleman who some would have be President and some would like to see him President still—Congressman Udall—Congressman, why don't you come right up front here.

In February of this year Phil Donahue had the opportunity to broadcast several of his shows from the U.S.S.R. Recently, both People and Time magazine devoted large or entire portions of their weekly magazines to the Soviet Union.

And personally for me, I had the honor to participate in the second ABC Capital-to-Capital program in October, which linked American lawmakers and members of the Supreme Soviet via satellite. We are told that more than 120 million Soviet citizens and more than 15 million Americans watched the exchange of views on human rights.

The third and final program for this year is scheduled for tomorrow night. Yet with all of the flurry of this activity, some have also questioned the benefits gained by these exchanges. The critics ask whether the Soviet Union is sending a fair representation of Soviet society, or whether the Soviets are using exchanges to send Government agents whose sole goal is to obtain technological information from their U.S. counterparts. Critics also ask whether our Soviet visitors are mere propaganda machines who are skilled at portraying a benign version of communism.

So the questions we need to ask today are whether exchanges really foster better relations between the two Governments and whether they truly serve our national interest.

Few Americans are better prepared to answer these questions than our distinguished panel of experts. Our first witness, Mr. Stephen Rhinesmith, is coordinator of the President's United States-Soviet Exchange Initiative. His office is charged with implementing the people-to-people initiatives and the cultural and educational exchanges agreement signed in Geneva in 1985.

Second is Mr. Jeremy Stone, who is the Director of the Federation of American Scientists. The Federation has been actively involved in promotion of congressional exchanges with the Soviet Union.

And finally, we have Mr. Mikhail Tsypkin, former Salvatori Fellow in Soviet Studies at the Heritage Foundation and now Assistant Professor and Coordinator of Soviet and East European Studies in the Department of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California.

I might note that he makes it very clear in the beginning of his statement and at the end of his statement that his views are his own and do not necessarily represent the views of the sponsor. So we understand that and we'll note that for the record.

At this time I would like to recognize for any comments that he would like to make, Congressman Udall. As many of you in this room may know, Congressman Udall has been a leader in this country and, indeed, internationally, on behalf of exchange programs.

Congressman Udall.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE MORRIS K. UDALL FROM ARIZONA

Representative UDALL. I am delighted to be here. I'm glad to see this hearing going on.

I'm simply going to say that I came to the conclusion a long time ago that the best way and perhaps the only way to make progress and to remove some of the poison from the relationships and attitudes between the Soviet Union and the United States was to get underway with programs in which people could meet people.

In my visits to the Soviet Union I was always struck by the way we could get along with ordinary citizens. And on the other hand, I was struck by the suspicion that is so evident at the highest levels of contact with the Soviet Union.

I was struck by the efficiency and the telling blows that were being rendered from time to time by youth exchange programs particularly. I would see as I went around Arizona some of the programs sponsored by the Rotary Club and by the Friends Committee, here were high school-age students from Germany, the Soviet Union, the Scandinavian countries, spending not just a few weeks as a vacation, but spending a whole academic year, living with an American family, learning the language, and the reverse being true. We, hopefully, if we have enough of these programs will bring a generation into power politically one of these days that will reject the stereotypes, and further programs of that sort.

It's been a really happy thing for me to see this grow with the original bill I introduced with more than 100 cosponsors 4 or 5 years ago. And all of a sudden, with the support and help of people like Chairman Hoyer and others, we were actually getting the Reagan administration to support some of these youth programs.

I think it's critically important we keep this flame alive and that we recognize this as an excellent forum to that purpose. I'm glad to participate.

Chairman HOYER. Thank you very much, Congressman.

Now I'd like to introduce for whatever comments he would like to make, Congressman Chris Smith of New Jersey, one of our most active and committed members of the Commission.

Representative

STATEMENT OF CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

Representative SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have a few questions. Unfortunately, I have a previous commitment. I'm going to have to leave this hearing, and I would like to have these questions submitted for the record.

Having heard part of what Mr. Udall said, I concur and would like to associate my remarks with him.

A constituent of mine who spent some time in the Soviet Union as part of an exchange sponsored by an organization located in Spokane, Washington, had a tremendous experience which was a real eye-opener not only for her, as she pointed out in the conversation we had, but also for her friends in the Soviet Union. I think this can be a beginning of trying to build bridges.

I have been disappointed in some of the exchanges that have been held, like the U.S. Sister Cities Program. One of my constitu-

ent towns, the city of Trenton, is a sister city of the Lenin District in Moscow. Unfortunately, there has not been in many of those exchanges any attempt to bring up human rights issues, or any issue that could perhaps bring a cloud over the conversations that are being held.

In a way this exchange is a very positive thing, but there are some deficiencies. I think honesty requires us and those who participate in exchanges to raise where appropriate these important issues of human rights and to let the Soviets know that that's always a bottom line issue with the United States.

Thank you.

Chairman HOYER. Thank you, Congressman.

At this time I'd like to introduce for whatever opening remarks he'd like to make, the Cochairman of the Commission, Senator DeConcini.

BRIEF OPENING REMARKS OF COCHAIRMAN DeCONCINI

Cochairman DECONCINI. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I apologize for being late, but the Rules Committee was meeting and needed a quorum, so I was roped into staying on.

PREPARED STATEMENT OF COCHAIRMAN DECONCINI

The question posed by Yale Richmond in his recent book on the subject -- U.S.-Soviet Cultural Exchanges ...: Who Wins? -- is a question which interests and concerns us all.

After thirty years of formalized exchanges on many levels with the Soviets, it is appropriate that we hold a hearing to examine the pluses and minuses of a policy which encourages citizen to citizen contact between the United States and the Soviet Union.

It is a policy which is difficult to measure in absolute terms. But, according to Marshall Shulman, "the changes we have witnessed in Soviet society over the past three decades have, without a doubt, been stimulated by multitudinous contacts, however gingerly they have been circumscribed."

The Helsinki Final Act recognizes the value of human contact and seeks to foster greater cooperation among the participating states by promoting exchange programs on many levels particularly those between private groups and organizations. Some would argue that the Soviets manipulate this to their benefit by sending representatives who are skilled at the use of propaganda and who subtlely inject a moderate view of communism. Our witnesses today will help us examine how and if they feel this trade-off can be balanced by the goodwill and impressions of American life which are generated by U.S. citizens interacting with their Soviet counterparts.

I would venture to guess that there is virtually no one in this room who does not have warm and lasting memories of meetings with groups or individuals from other countries. Such encounters tend to take on their own life and spontaneity which cannot be completely controlled by government dictates. It is our job to ensure that exchanges are managed so that the inhibiting formalities of government-organized programs are minimized without compromising our national security interests. A truly effective exchange policy must seek to foster an atmosphere in which the natural tendancy of the human spirit to share common interests and feelings with others is promoted and encouraged within responsible limits. I look forward to hearing from our witnesses today about how we can best achieve this objective.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go ahead with the witnesses. Due to my tardiness I just ask that my statement be put in the record. I look forward to these hearings.

Chairman HOYER. All right. Thank you very much and we're appreciative of the fact that despite being incredibly busy, Senator DeConcini has been very faithful in terms of his leadership on this Commission.

I'd like to introduce at this time Mr. Stephen Rhinesmith. Mr. Rhinesmith is currently Coordinator of the President's United States-Soviet Exchange Initiative. The Coordinator's Office was established by President Reagan to ensure effective coordination between the U.S. private sector, the U.S. Government, and the Soviet Government in implementing the People-to-People Initiatives and the Cultural and Educational Exchanges Agreement signed, as I said earlier, at the Geneva Summit in 1985.

Mr. Rhinesmith has more than 25 years of experience in international exchanges and was president of the American Field Service International Scholarship Program between 1971 and 1980.

Mr. Rhinesmith, we thank you for being with us and look forward to your testimony.

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN RHINESMITH

Mr. RHINESMITH. Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, thank you for this opportunity to appear here this morning.

Before I begin my testimony I'd like to say that this is my final appearance as Coordinator of the President's United States-Soviet Exchange Initiative. I will be returning this week to the private sector to pursue a range of possibilities for continued work in this field. As you know, my background is with private exchange organizations. I'm committed to play a role in the further development of contacts and exchanges as a private citizen.

The last 2 years have been extraordinarily rewarding and challenging to me and much has been accomplished in broadening the dialog between the United States and the Soviet Union.

I feel strongly that the work of the Coordinator's Office should and will continue, carried on by my colleagues, Dr. Guroff and Mrs. Raymond, who have worked closely with me since the office was created.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today and to share with you some thoughts about the past and future of American exchanges with the Soviet Union.

Exchanges are but a small part of our bilateral relationship, though I believe an important part. I would like to focus my remarks today on two areas: The current situation and future concerns which must be taken into account as we go forward to broaden the United States-Soviet exchange process.

When the General Exchanges Agreement was signed in Geneva in November 1985, and President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev committed themselves to an expansion of contacts, there was an extraordinary flurry of interest and activity.

When my office was created shortly thereafter, we were greeted by thousands of letters and proposals from organizations and individuals who wished to participate in Soviet-American exchanges.

While we have received a number of letters protesting any contacts with the Soviet Union, the overwhelmingly positive tone of letters indicated that the President had touched a very responsive chord in the American people.

Our office was established in the U.S. Information Agency by order of the President. I report to the U.S. Information Agency Director Charles Wick, who has been very supportive of our efforts over the last 2 years.

I should point out that my office was given a reasonably unique role to play. We have no money to give out. We provide advice and facilitation to private organizations who wish to establish exchanges. No one is constrained to deal with us. Our effectiveness is only as good as our credibility with private organizations.

With the expansion of exchanges there has been a renewed focus on many concerns in dealing with the Soviet Union, concerns I am happy to say that most private organizations have been more than willing to address.

We've always been cognizant of questions of reciprocity in exchanges, issues of security such as technology transfer, and problems of equal access to the media. But with the expansion of exchanges which has occurred and the number of new actors in the field, these issues have taken on new urgency.

In the 2 years since the signing of the new agreement, we have witnessed a virtual return to the high levels of exchanges in the 1970's and traditional programs and significant ventures into entirely new areas.

Most exchange programs which existed in the 1970's have been reconstituted. Those which receive USIA funding have returned at least to the levels of the past. The Flagship Program, USIA's traveling national exhibition, will once again attract several million visitors this year and next.

Information USA is currently in Rostov, the third of nine Soviet cities it will visit, although its future hangs on the resolution of USIA's funding, including the conference on our authorization which is taking place today.

Academic exchanges, whether through IREX or the Fulbright Lecturers Program have returned to past levels. In addition, exchanges of young political leaders cultural figures, museum exhibits and performing artists have all been reestablished. The latter is still hindered by problems of reciprocity, although we may be making some progress with a sometimes recalcitrant Ministry of Culture.

But what is new? First, as Congressman Udall mentioned, high school exchanges. Until the past year we have seen no reciprocal movement of Soviet high school-age students to the United States. Now, in addition to a number of delegations of young people, we are beginning to see the establishment of regular on-going high school exchanges. The first of these between Phillips Andover Academy and the Physics and Mathematics Special School in Novosibirsk. We have completed two cycles of this exchange, which has gone better than we could expect. Ten students live and study in each other's schools for a period of 5 weeks. The success of the program has led the Soviets to begin to accept other similar ventures,

and we are in the process of talking about not only expansion of these, but also the lengthening of these exchanges.

Second, are university undergraduates. A substantial number of American undergraduates have visited the Soviet Union to study Russian or to travel. The reciprocal flow has been inconsequential. This fall, under the Presidential Initiative, the Institute of International Education has begun a reciprocal exchange of Soviet fifth-year university students and American graduating seniors. While the program involves 10 Soviet undergraduates in the United States for a semester and 5 Americans there for a year, it is a significant start.

A range of American proposals for undergraduate exchanges are on the table, and we have seen some positive signs from the Soviet side that they're willing to work in this area.

Third, people-to-people exchanges. It is in this area that we've noted the most substantial expansion of exchange activity. We've tried to make a distinction between exchanges which we define as a reciprocal flow of people and American groups who are merely going to the Soviet Union as tourists.

The Sister Cities Program, which has already been referred to, has been one of the areas of significant growth. In the 1970's, out of six sister city relationships on paper, only Seattle/Tashkent could really be seen as an on-going program.

Since the signing of the agreement, we've witnessed a virtual explosion of activity. There are now 16 active partnerships with another 16 pending.

Most important, the two sides have discovered that sister city relationship need not be confined to visiting delegations of officials, but can be expanded to include exchanges of school children, university exchanges and cultural exchanges.

I should note also that the question of human rights has been the subject of great discussion at sister city conferences and in the board of directors of the Sister Cities Movement, and our office has been consulting with them in terms of developing what we consider to be a responsible human rights policy in sister city dialogs. That includes enabling the human rights issues to be raised on the agenda of all sister city meetings. There is discussion within sister cities about this policy. There are differences of opinion but our position has been to consistently press the human rights concern within the sister city dialog.

Chautauqua Institution is a second example of our people-to-people exchanges. Much publicity has been attached to this project, and deservedly so. The Chautauqua conferences have been a major breakthrough for exchanges in a variety of areas. While privately funded, the process has represented a model of private/government sector of cooperation. Mixed delegations of government and private individuals have represented Chautauqua and have participated in a week-long conference. A public dialog before substantial audiences has been carried out on major issues of Soviet-American relations.

At the last meeting over 190 Soviet citizens were housed with American families, a major shift in Soviet attitudes. Plans are proceeding to continue and broaden the Chautauqua process.

The success of the Chautauqua process should have a positive impact on the development of other similar proposals. We are very supportive of a proposal from the American Center for International Leadership to host a reciprocal series of conferences for young leaders between the ages of 25 and 40 within the Chautauqua format.

Professional exchanges have also been an area of citizen exchange development over the last 2 years. Our hope is that the exchange process will produce an on-going dialog between the professionals of the two countries, who can participate in joint projects.

There are many problems that arise from a lack of symmetry between the two countries. Are American and Soviet journalists comparable?

The areas of psychiatry and law have been particularly troublesome and must be closely negotiated to assure that we are not giving credence to the Soviet interpretation of these professions.

But progress has been made. The creation of the American-Soviet Film Initiative has broadened contacts between film makers of the two countries. Earthwatch has signed an agreement which will provide the possibility for Americans and Soviets to join together in a variety of professional undertakings, such as archeological digs and environmental projects.

And finally, the space bridge phenomenon has been applied to journalists, scientists, and as Congressman Hoyer pointed out, even to the U.S. Congress.

It is impossible in this statement to cover all the areas of exchanges, but I've touched on some of the highlights. Let me now turn briefly to five areas of future concern in the development of United States-Soviet exchanges.

First, symmetry. Soviet and American societies are fundamentally different, as we all know. Private American organizations deal with official Soviet organizations, whether they are governmental or, as the Soviets call them, public organizations. The Soviet side can choose among a plethora of American groups and play them off against each other, while American groups have little choice with whom they deal.

Moreover, American exchangees, regardless of the program they are part of, engage in exchanges as individuals speaking their own minds while Soviet exchangees are chosen by their organizations and many times do not act as individuals.

A second problem is reciprocity. We have gone to extraordinary lengths in negotiations over the new exchanges agreement to ensure reciprocity in exchanges. Given, again, the wide range of American organizations involved in exchanges and a variety of views which they represent, ensuring reciprocity is a major problem, though we are all working at it.

I've been pleased by the willingness of American organizations to take this issue seriously and to demand from the Soviet side, arrangements which are equal and with mutual benefit to those provided by the American organizations.

Third, is the question of U.S. Government policy and human rights within these exchanges. American exchange organizations are obviously not obligated to support American Government policy and some, in fact, are opposed in principle. A broader prob-

lem, however, among the majority of organizations has been the issue of how to be supportive of American policy without endangering the purpose of their exchanges.

I've been highly gratified by the willingness of diverse American organizations to work with us, to brief their organizations on U.S. Government policy, and to be supportive of efforts to raise such issues as human rights to their Soviet counterparts. This is an ongoing issue but one with which American organizations have been more than willing to grapple, and I believe that in the citizen exchange areas in particular their willingness will continue.

Fourth, is the area of finance. In the blush of Geneva, hundreds of organizations proposed exchange agreements with the Soviet Union. Few, however, had thought through the financial implications of long-term exchanges over a long period of time. Given the current situation, there is no prospect for substantial increase of U.S. Government funding for exchanges. We have tried to work with private organizations to uncover new sources of private funding for exchanges, and my office has been instrumental in finding approximately $2 million in the last 2 years from private sources to be applied to private exchange programs.

This process has been successful in the short-term, but I have considerable doubts that we have a secure base to confidently predict the continuing and expanding support which will be needed to sustain Soviet-U.S. exchanges in the years ahead.

Finally, we have a new phenomenon under perestroika which is Soviet commercialization of exchanges. We have long felt that the monopoly held by such Soviet organizations such as Intourist has been a major obstacle to exchanges. This is a view shared by many of our Soviet colleagues. For most American and particularly Soviet, organizations noncurrency exchanges appear to provide the best hope for expansion. Soviet organizations have little hard currency and they had hoped to be able to cover costs of incoming Americans in rubles, while the American organizations cover the cost of hosting Soviets here. Intourist in its thirst for dollars has made this very difficult, because they control most of the hotels in which American exchangees stay. The move to place more and more Soviet organizations on a self-financing basis a la perestroika also raises a number of issues for the future.

Such a move in the sports area has made it possible for the Soviet side to receive more Americans, but severely limited the opportunities for exchange.

Now we're seeing similar economic changes in the university system, in which universities are saying that they will be charging far greater fees for American students studying in the Soviet Union than they have in the past.

It is too early to tell if this will provide more or fewer possibilities for exchange. It is possible, particularly in the university system, that more universities will want to participate in order to receive hard currency income. But it is a development worth watching carefully.

Exchanges are always subject to the influence of the prevailing political climate, but they have become a bit more insulated in recent years. We in the U.S. Government are firmly committed to the proposition that we enter exchange agreements that are in our

interest, not as a favor to the other side. We have found surprisingly broad acceptance of this position among organizations engaged in the exchange process in the private sector. General acceptance of this proposition will go a long way toward providing a solid basis for exchanges.

I believe we have made significant progress in the last 2 years in broadening the dialog between people in the United States and the Soviet Union. I hope this will continue in a responsible way in the future, and I thank you for the opportunity to share this overview with you.

I'll be happy to respond to any questions and would like to submit for the record an evaluation of our work recently prepared by a private nonprofit organization in the cultural exchange field, which reviews the exchanges of the last 2 years against the President's statement before he went to Geneva on November 14, documenting for each of the areas, in culture and in education and in sports and in youth what exchanges have taken place over the last 2 years. I think it's a very good record, which was done by the Ark Communications Institute on the West Coast.

Thank you very much.

Chairman HOYER. Thank you very much, Mr. Rhinesmith. We appreciate it.

Next I want to call on Mikhail Tsypkin, an emigre from the Soviet Union, who grew up in Moscow. He is a former Salvatori Fellow in Soviet Studies at the Heritage Foundation, as I said earlier, and is currently teaching at the Naval Postgraduate School in Monterey, California.

Mr. Tsypkin, we very much appreciate your being with us, sir.

STATEMENT OF MIKHAIL TSYPKIN

Mr. TSYPKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, esteemed members. I would like to say how deeply honored and moved I am to testify at these hearings.

The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe embodies the good work of many Americans concerned about human rights worldwide. And without your efforts I would have never been able to be here as a free man.

The subject of Soviet-American exchanges is a most appropriate one for consideration by this Commission because the issues of human contacts between East and West, as defined by the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, clearly fall within the jurisdiction of the CSCE.

It is undoubtedly beneficial for the United States to end the isolation imposed on the Soviet people by its Government for the last 70 years, and that is why Soviet-American exchanges are greeted so favorably across the political spectrum in this country.

But exchanges are a policy and every policy has not only benefits but certain costs to it, and the requirement I think is that we develop a balanced policy of exchanges which takes into consideration both plusses and minuses that can be involved.

The basic problem, as I see it, with Soviet-American exchanges is as follows: It will take a very long time before increased exposure of Soviet citizens to America results in decisive changes in Soviet political mentality and subsequently in qualitatively better charac-

ter of the relations between the two nations. It will take, at the same time, much less time before the Soviets can reap benefits from exchanges in the sphere of military technology and propaganda.

The greatest plus of exchanges in my view is the improved understanding that Americans develop of the Soviet political system and society from going to the Soviet Union. To achieve maximum benefits for visiting Americans, we should first of all insist on long-term exchanges. Americans should preferably stay in the Soviet Union, if possible at all, from a couple of months to a year.

Then, American visitors, especially students, should not be segregated from their Soviet counterparts. The Soviets have a tendency to keep journalists, diplomats, foreign students as far as possible from mainstream Soviet life. We should strive to end this as soon as possible.

We should also strive for greater geographic dispersion of our exchange visitors. Too many of them stick around Moscow and Leningrad. That would be like coming to America and seeing New York and Boston and saying, well, I've seen America. It doesn't work that way.

I should also say very frankly that I am somewhat skeptical of the lately fashionable quick trips to the Soviet Union and back. And I say so because I lived through a cross-cultural experience of my own. I came to America and settled here and had to learn about the new society, and I can tell you I'm convinced that had I stayed here a couple of weeks even with best intentions, with best knowledge of English, I wouldn't have learned very much. So I'm a strong supporter of sending Americans, particularly young Americans, for as long as practicable to the Soviet Union.

The other side is how much the Soviets learn from coming here and understanding America. And on the basis of experience we should not be too confident about the immediate positive impact of exposing the Soviet visitors to our democratic values.

There is no established correlation between visiting a democratic society and becoming a Democrat. On the one hand, Lenin, the father of Soviet communism, spent most of his adult life in Great Britain and Switzerland, and he had nothing but contempt for democratic values. On the other hand, the most active proponent of democracy in the Soviet Union, Dr. Andrei Sakharov, has never been out of the Soviet Union in his whole life.

We should not assume that spending time in the United States as an exchange student necessarily makes a Soviet, or for that matter any foreigner, a friend of the United States. For example, one of Mr. Gorbachev's top foreign policy aides, Aleksandr Yakovlev, was one of the first exchange students in this country. He spent a year at Columbia University. Then he was for 10 years an Ambassador to Canada. So he has very considerable exposure to the United States, and he's one of the most virulently anti-American writers in the Soviet Union. In his book, published a couple of years ago, "From Truman to Reagan," he suggested that Americans needed a shock of pain, just like the one in Vietnam, in order to feel shame and disenchantment instead of jingoism. He described the United States as a country of generally very poorly informed people indifferent to suffering and troubles of others, and

referred to the American middle class as the carrier of nationalist, racist, chauvinistic and militaristic sentiments and strivings. He attributed the fact that America signed the SALT I agreement to the defeat in Vietnam, and concluded by saying that the American state is permeated with chauvinism and messianism. And unfortunately there are a variety of examples like that.

Many of the Soviets who come to the United States as journalists or exchange visitors then report back a picture of American life so distorted that it can really cause nothing but bad feelings among the Soviets to the United States.

For example, Vladimir Simonov, for years a correspondent of the Literary Gazette in the United States, compared resurgence of patriotism in this country to an epileptic fit.

A member of a delegation of young political leaders visiting the United States reported back home that President Reagan welcomed AIDS as a Godsent means to clean society from social scum.

This is a problem. Again, studying American society at firsthand does not necessarily bring Soviets to conclusions which in my modest view, are conducive to peace. For instance, Mr. Zamoshkin, who is one of the notable scholars of American society in the Soviet Union in the Institute of USA and Canada, came to a conclusion that the best way for the Soviets to deal with the United States is to keep Americans vulnerable to nuclear threat. Again, this is not a conclusion which is really very helpful to Soviet-American relations.

I should also say that even if the stream of Soviet visitors to the United States increases tenfold, the Soviet Government will retain an ability to select such visitors from the ranks of the privileged, and to use such visits as a reward for political loyalty, because a trip to the United States for a Soviet citizen is a very big thing. And thus increased exchanges with the United States might actually induce more Soviets to act as political conformists.

So there are certain limitations on what exchanges can do in terms of mutual understanding.

I want to make a special reference to the issue of scientific contacts. I should say that the Soviets from everything I see, are extremely concerned about the quality of their science and technology at this point, and frequently justify Gorbachev's policy of restructuring by the need to further improve their defense technologies, among other things.

In the 1970's, with Soviet-American exchanges in full swing, the security aspect of scientific exchanges was frequently overlooked. Soviet scientists used, according to the Department of Defense, exchange visits to American research centers to obtain information on important military projects. And Soviet exchangees worked at a variety of institutions, from MIT to Stanford to Georgia Tech on projects which could be useful for the Soviet military.

It's often argued that the mere presence of Soviet scientists at American research centers tells them nothing they could not learn by reading American scientific literature. As partially this is of course true, because we have a very open, very abundant scientific literature, but we should also realize that personal contacts are extremely important for scientists. And a recent study by Rand Corporation said that the critical information for linking theoretical

knowledge to mass production is know-how, which is something the Soviets cannot find in journals. And obtaining know-how requires personal contact, which applies not only to transfer of know-how concerning a device or process, but also to purely theoretical information.

One of the big problems we have here is that according to authoritative Soviet military sources, it is becoming increasingly difficult to draw the line between what in modern science is important for military research and development and what is not. The resulting problem for Soviet-American scientific exchanges is that it is increasingly difficult to judge whether granting access to a research facility in this country to a Soviet scientist will result in enhancing Soviet military technology or not.

In relation to this, I would like to comment on exchanges of undergraduates. It's important to realize that a Soviet undergraduate is very different from an American undergraduate. Soviet undergraduate training is in essence professional training. Ten young men who are now going to study chemistry and physics in Yale and the University of Maryland will in a year not enroll in a graduate school; they will go work as engineers in electronics R&D facilities, et cetera. Most of the Soviet specialists never go beyond education in college. So we're talking about professional training.

So, again, undergraduate exchanges will not relieve certain security concerns we will have.

Another problem with exchanges is that sometimes the Soviets use those exchanges to give respectability to the institutions and personalities involved in violations of human rights. The most notorious example of the latter kind has been the exchange agreement signed in 1985, between the American Bar Association and the Association of Soviet Lawyers, ASL. ASL is not a working organization of Soviet lawyers but, rather, a special body established in order to conduct propaganda against human rights activists and Jewish refuseniks at home and to whitewash Soviet violations of human rights in the West. I will not go into detailing the anti-Semitic and antihuman rights activities of the Association of Soviet Lawyers.

What I would like to say here is that the decision of the American Bar Association to treat ASL in a collegial fashion has caused a barrage of criticism in this country. To defuse this criticism the American Bar Association insists that the exchange agreement with the Association of Soviet Lawyers provides the American lawyers with a chance to press vigorously behind the scenes for the improvement in human rights practices of the Soviets.

I have an illustration here of how really feeble that pressure is. It's a memorandum from the then president of the American Bar Association, William Falsgraf, on his meeting with Soviet President Gromyko in 1986. The only reference from the American side regarding human rights in all this meeting has been as follows:

> President Falsgraf advised President Gromyko that Jewish groups in the United States and Jewish members of the American Bar Association are concerned about U.S.S.R.'s policy with respect to emigration to Israel. Again, President Falsgraf pointed out that this is a minority view but a minority view held with great sincerity.

I have the whole text of the memorandum appended to my statement and I hope that that memorandum will be entered into the record, because it should be preserved for history.

A related point is that there is no clearinghouse of information on Soviet institutions and individuals to which you can turn if you want to start an exchange program. Such a clearinghouse in my opinion should be established. Perhaps it's an appropriate role for the staff of the Helsinki Commission to start such a clearinghouse which would allow people a chance to know whom they are getting in touch with in the Soviet Union.

It's clear that Soviet-American exchanges can serve our national interest well, provided that there is a balanced policy which is exercised by the Federal Government and that this policy is the beneficiary of a serious interest from the U.S. Congress and public groups involved in Soviet-American exchanges cooperate well with both the administration and Congress.

My specific recommendations are that the CSCE should make hearings on Soviet-American exchanges a regular part of its work.

CSCE should be able to ask for reports on the state of Soviet-American exchanges, both from the Interagency Coordinating Committee on United States-Soviet Affairs, the so-called ICCUSA, which oversees all U.S. Government activities with respect to the Soviet Union, as well as from the Committee on Exchanges, the so-called COMEX, of the Technology Transfer Intelligence Committee, which deals with the security aspects of Soviet-American exchanges.

CSCE should invite representatives of the public involved in Soviet-American exchanges and in monitoring human rights situation in the Soviet Union to testify about exchange programs and their impact on human rights.

The CSCE should establish a clearinghouse of information on Soviet institutions and personalities.

This is my statement. Thank you very much.

Chairman HOYER. Thank you very much, Mr. Tsypkin. I read your statement before you gave it. You obviously shortened it, but we appreciate the work that you've done. You made a number, in my opinion, very useful suggestions, and we will be reviewing them.

I assure you that the attachment to your statement will be made a part of the record, and we'll pursue some of your suggestions.

Thank you.

Mr. TSYPKIN. Thank you.

ATTACHMENT TO MR. MIKHAIL TSYPKIN'S STATEMENT

SOVIET-AMERICAN EXCHANGES: PROMISES AND PROBLEMS.

A Testimony to the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe of the United States Congress

by

Mikhail Tsypkin, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor and Coordinator of Soviet and East European Studies
Department of National Security Affairs
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California.*

November 17, 1987.

* This testimony is not meant to reflect the opinions and views of the Department of the Navy or any other U.S. government agency.

I am deeply honored and moved to testify at these hearings. The Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe embodies the good work of many Americans concerned about human rights worldwide. Without your efforts I would have never been able to be here as a free man.

The subject of Soviet-American exchanges is a most appropriate one for consideration by the Commission for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), because the issues of human contacts between East and West, as defined by the Helsinki Final Act of 1975, clearly fall within the jurisdiction of the CSCE, and because the members of CSCE have collectively accumulated, due to their constant involvement with Soviet affairs, an expertise in this field greater than that available in any other committee of U.S. Congress.

NEED FOR A BALANCED POLICY.

The new opportunities presented by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev's policies of ***perestroika*** ("restructuring) and ***glasnost'*** ("openness") for human contacts between American and Soviet citizens seem quite exciting. TV link-ups, free-wheeling debates at various fora, forthcoming exchanges between Soviet and American undergraduate students--all of this appears to be the first step towards something Americans have desired since World War II: a greater mutual understanding between the Soviet and American peoples, leading to a more peaceful world. There is a pronounced tendency accross the whole spectrum of political opinion in this country to see Soviet-American exchanges as unreservedly beneficial to this nation. But in the real world there is no such thing as a policy with only benefits and without any costs to it. If our hopes for Soviet-American exchanges are not to turn into a bitter disappointment (something that happens all too frequently in Soviet-American relations) we must come up with a balanced policy in this matter, which realistically takes into account both pluses and minuses of US-USSR exchanges.

There is no doubt that reducing the isolation imposed on the Soviet people by its own regime for the last seventy years generally would serve American national interest. But we should not make a mistake of assuming that the Soviet regime will not attempt to make wide use of increased exchanges for its own ends inimical to our national interest. The basic problem is as follows:

It will take a very long time before increased exposure of Soviet citizens to America results in decisive changes in Soviet political mentality and subsequently in qualitatively better character of the relations between the two nations. It will take much less time, however, before the Soviets can reap benefits from exchanges in the sphere of military technology and propaganda.

We should recognize that exchanges require wise policy management and oversight, and that regular involvement of the CSCE in these matters can significantly contribute to making Soviet-American exchanges benficial to the our national interest.

UNDERSTANDING THE SOVIETS.

The one clear benefit this nation can derive from exchanges with the Soviets is our improved understanding of their system of government and society. To achieve maximum benefits for visiting Americans, exchange programs should meet the following requirements:

- American visitors should preferably stay for reasonably long periods of time in the Soviet Union, from 2 or 4 months to a year.

- American visitors, especially students, should live as their Soviet counterparts do. The Soviets have succeeded in segregating Western diplomats and journalists in special compounds in Moscow; they usually segregate exchange students as well. While it will be difficult to end isolation of American diplomats and journalists in the immediate future, the isolation of American students should be ended as soon as possible.

• Greater geographic dispersion of Americans on exchange visits to the Soviet Union should be achieved. Now they are all too frequently concentrated in Moscow and Leningrad. This definitely limits their perspective on life in the Soviet Union.

I should say very frankly that I am sceptical of quick visits to the Soviet Union so fashionable today. [1] When I came to this country as an immigrant 10 years ago, I had to go through the process of learning about a different culture, a different society. On the basis of my own cross-cultural experience, I am confident that had I spent only several weeks in the United States, I would have understood very little about this society. Therefore, I am sure that the utility of short visits to the USSR by multitudes of Americans not speaking Russian and depending heavily on their official Soviet hosts is only marginal.

UNDERSTANDING THE AMERICANS.

We should not be, on the basis of experience, too certain about the positive impact of exposing Soviet visitors to our democratic values. Several cautionary points should be made to avoid excessive expectations.

• Historically, penetration of Western ideas and values into the Russian society was a painful and uneven process. Indeed, throughout the XVIII, XIX and early XXth century Russia's educated classes tried to intoduce Western ideas and values into their nation's political life, but with very limited success: the Russian society was too large (as it is today), the bureaucracy was too entrenched (as it is today), and the political requirements of keeping a huge multinational overland empire together were too pressing (as they are today) for drastic liberalization to occur.

• There is, unfortunately, no established correlation between visiting a democratic society and becoming a democrat. On the one hand, Vladimir Lenin, the father of Soviet totalitarian communism, spent most of his adult life in exile in such democratic nations as Great Britain and Switzerland. So did a number of other leading early Soviet communists. On the other hand, Dr. Andrei Sakharov, the most

---

[1] For a description of this new fashion, see Barbara Gamarekian, "A Hot Ticket Is Round Trip, to or from Moscow," The New York Times, Nobember 9, 1987.

consistent proponent of democracy in the Soviet Union, has never been to the West.

• We should not assume that spending time as an exchange student in the United States necessarily makes a Soviet (or, for that matter, any other foreigner) a friend of the United States. Example: one of General Secretary Gorbachev's top foreign policy aides, Aleksandr Yakovlev, a member of the Politburo and a Secretary of the Central Committee responsible for propaganda, spent a whole year in the late 1950s as one of the first Soviet exchange students at Columbia University. He also served as a Soviet Ambassador to Canada from 1973 to 1983. Despite his great exposure to the United States as a student and as a diplomat, he is now one of the most virulently anti-American writers in the Soviet Union. His recent book, From Truman to Reagan, suggests that Americans need "a shock of pain, just like the one in Vietnam ... in order to feel shame and disenchantment instead of jingoism;" it describes the United States as "a country of generally poorly informed people indifferent to suffering and troubles of others," and the American middle class as the "carrier of nationalist, racist, chauvinistic and militaristic sentiments and strivings." Yakovlev attributes American signing of SALT I to "the defeat in Vietnam," and concludes by saying that the American state is "permeated with chauvinism and messianism."[2] As the official reponsible for the work of Soviet mass media, Mr. Yakovlev has overseen several viciously anti-American disinformation campaigns, including the one accusing the United States of manufacturing the AIDS virus, acusing the CIA of organizing the massacre in Jamestown massacre, and chraging the United States with importing babies from the Third World in order to obtain transplant organs from them.

• The Soviets who come to the United States as newsmen or exchange visitors in many (if not most) cases report to the Soviet public a picture of the United States so distorted that it can cause the Soviet people to hate and dislike America. Vladimir Simonov, the correspondent of the Novosti Press Agency and of the Literaturnaya Gazeta in the United States, compared the recent resurgence of patriotism in American to an "epyleptic fit."[3] A member of a recent delegation of young Soviet political leaders to the United States, upon

---

2 A.N.Yakovlev, Ot Trumena do Reygana (Moscow: Molodaya gvardiya, 1984) pp. 12, 34, 155, 398.

3 Vladimir Simonov, "Yablochnyy pirog bez yablok," Literaturnaya Gazeta, October 16, 1985.

his return informed the Soviet public that President Reagan allegedly welcomed AIDS as the means to "destroy the scum of the society and to strengthen the family," and that Gorbachev was more popular in the US than Reagan.[4]

• Studying American society at first hand does not necessarily bring the Soviets to conclusions conducive to peaceful relations between both nations. Thus, a noted Soviet student of American public opinion Yuri Zamoshkin from the Institute of USA Canada, came to believe that the best way for the Soviets to deal with the United States is by keeping American people vulnerable to nuclear threat:

> The "factor of fear" of the threat of nuclear war and of the American vulnerability in such a war can apparently stimulate the anti-militarist mood of the Americans, their striving for peaceful agreements and normalization of relations with the USSR only under certain conditions. One of such conditions is destruction of the illusion that the USA can reach such a level of development of nuclear strength and ballistic missile defense that would reduce the risk of nuclear war or save Americans in case of war.[5]

• Even if the stream of Soviet visitors to the United States increases tenfold, the Soviet government will retain an ability to select such visitors from the ranks of the privileged, and use such visits as a reward for political loyalty. Thus, increased chances of visiting the United States might induce more Soviets to act as political conformists. Soviet-American exchanges will begin to have a genuinely positive impact on the relations between the two nations only when controls on travel of Soviet citizens to the West, including the United States, are greatly relaxed to conform with the norms accepted in most of the world, and when Soviet citizens can have a real say in their nation's political system.

---

4 Literaturnaya Gazeta, September 9, 1987.
5 Yu. Zamoshkin, "Yadernaya opasnost' i faktor strakha," SShA. Ekonomika. Politika. Ideologiya, 1985, No.3, p.7.

AVOIDING PITFALLS.

If Soviet-American exchanges are to further the national interest of the United States, two types fo pitfalls should be avoided. One is that the Soviets will use their access to American scientific and research and development community to increase their military strength. The other one is that the Soviets will use exchanges for legitimizing their violations of human rights.

THE ISSUE OF SCIENTIFIC CONTACTS.

The possiblity that Soviet arsenal will not keep pace with the latest developments of world science and technology is haunting the Soviet leaders. Gorbachev's policy of ***perestroyka*** (restructuring) is frequently rationalized by the Soviets themselves as the means for further improving their defense technologies. The problems of access to Western science and technology stand foremost among the Soviet concerns. Prime Minister Nikolai Ryzhkov expressed concern that the correlation of military strength between East and West will shift against the Soviet Union if the latter is "isolated" from "modern technologies."[6]

In the 1970s, with the excitement over Soviet-American exchanges in the air, the security aspect of scientific exchanges was all too frequently overlooked. As a result, according to the Department of Defense, Soviet scientists used their exchange visits to American research centers to obtain information on such militarily significant projects as fuel-air explosive devices, "wing-in-ground effect" aerodynamic vehicles, and heads-up displays.[7] They worked on communications problems at the Operations Research Center at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT); on computers at the Operations Research Center at Berkeley, the Digital Systems Laboratory at Stanford, and Computer Science Department at UCLA; on ceramic materials (crucial for space technology) at the Department of Material Science and Engineering at MIT; on aircraft gas turbine engines at the Department of Aeronautical Science and Mechanical

---

6 "Kursom nauchno-tekhnicheskogo progressa," Izvestiya, December 18, 1985.

7 The Honorable Frank Carclucci, "A Letter to Dr. William D. Carey," Science, January 8, 1982, pp.140-141. Fuel-air explosive munitions are based on a principle of creating an aerosol cloud of fuel-air mixture which is then detonated to achieve an explosive effect. A "wing-in-ground effect" aerodynamic vehicle is an extremely low flying aircraft; heads-up displays are used to project flight data on aircraft cockpit glass.

Engineering at Northwestern University and at the Department of Aerospace Engineering at Georgia Institute of Technology; on space technology at the Department of Aeronautics at MIT, and so on and so forth.[8]

Even a cursory look at the institutional affiliation of Soviet participants in only one exchange program (International Research and Exchanges Board, established in 1968 by the American Council of Learned Societies) shows that many Soviet participants were drawn from some of the most famous institutions for training military research and development specialists and conducting their own research and development programs for the military. Thus, the Moscow Institute of Engineering Physics dispatched eleven scientists to study in the U.S.; Moscow Advanced Technical School named adfter Bauman (the alma mater of Andrei Tupolev, the famous aircraft designer, and of Sergei Korolev, the father of the first Soviet ICBM), four; the Moscow Aviation Institute sent four; Moscow Institute of Steel and Alloys, three: Moscow Physical and Technical Institute, two; Moscow Institute of Electronic Technology, two; Kuibyshev Aviation Institute, three; Leningrad Aircraft Instrumentation Institute, two; Leningrad Shipbuilding Institute, two; and Leningrad Polytechnical Institute, three. (I should note that it was not the job of IREX to screen the Soviet exchange candidates, but of the U.S. Government, which apparently failed to do so.)

The situation has obviously improved since the beginning of 1980s, as a result of greater concern about Soviet illegal transfers of militarily significant Western technologies, as well as of the reduced flow of exchanges in the aftermath of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Now, with the number of Soviet exchange scientists obviously increasing, it is important to exercise caution and discretion when deciding on which Soviet scientist is to be admitted where.

It is often argued that the mere presence of Soviet scientists' at American research centers tells them nothing they could not learn by reading American scientific

---

[8] International Research and Exchanges Board. Annual Report 1977-78 (New York: IREX, 1979), pp.48-51; International Research and Exchanges Board. Annual Report 1979-80 (New York: IREX, 1981), pp.45-46; International Research and Exchanges Board. Annual Report 1980-81 (New York: IREX, 1982), pp.44-46.

literature. This is only partially true. This argument overlooks the fact, emphasized in a recent study of Soviet science by the Rand Corporation, that the critical information for linking theoretical knowledge to mass production is know-how, which is something the Soviets cannot find in journals. Obtaining know-how "requires personal contact... This applies to the transfer not only of know-how concerning a device or process, but also to purely theoretical information." In addition, because of the Russian tradition of relying on Western science and technology, information about Western developments serves as a catalyst for the Soviet decision-making in science and R&D, helping overcome bureaucratic inertia.[9]

The Soviets in fact have an established tradition of Western training for future leaders of their military research and development. The "father" of the first Soviet ICBMs, Sergei Korolev, had been an apprentice of a French aircraft designer, Paul Richard. So were Chief Designer of helicopters N.Kamov, Chief Deisgner of flying boats G. Beriev, and one of the two Chief Deisgners of MIG aircraft, M. Gurevich. The man who designed the gun for the famous T-34 tank of World War II, Vasily Grabin, had been trained by German artillery engineers, while the Chief Designer of magnetrons (powerful vacuum tubes) for Soviet radars, Anatoliy Fedoseev, had been a trainee at RCA in the United States. While the Soviets are much more technologically advanced now that fifty, or forty, or even twenty years ago, they still look to the West when major changes in science and technology are on the horizon.

Indeed, Soviet military leaders believe that today military affairs are undergoing a profound revolution due to the fast pace of technolgical development, on the scale of the one which took place after World War II with the introduction of nuclear weapons, electronics, and missile technology. Soviet authoritative sources, such as Major General M. Yasyukov, a professor at the Voroshilov Academy of the Soviet General Staff, emphasize the fact that it is becoming increasingly difficult to draw the line between what in modern science is important for military R&D and what is not:

---

9 Arthur Alexander, Soviet Science and Weapons Acquisition (Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corp., 1982), pp.37-39.

> ...the leading directions of scientific-technological progress--the robotics, computer technology, instrument making, and electronics--are at the same time the basic catalyst of military-technical progress.[10]

The resulting problem for Soviet-American scientific exchanges is that it is becoming increasingly difficult to judge whether granting access to a research facility in this country to a Soviet scientist will result in enhancing Soviet military technology or not.

Forthcoming exchanges of undergraduate students is latest step in enhanced Soviet-American human contacts. While exposing young Soviets to the American university life is certainly a good idea, it does not remove the security issue from the agenda because of the differences in Soviet and American systems of higher education, and because of the differences between Soviet and American young people.

• A Soviet undergraduate is pursuing **strictly professional training** to a much greater degree than his/her American counterpart, and has little hope or need of ever going to graduate school or of changing the profession he/she has acquired in college. Thus, a twenty-year old student from the Moscow Institute of Electronic Technology spends a year in an American university, graduates from his own college in a couple of years, and the age of 24 is professionally employed as an electronics engineer in Soviet research and development community. It is noteworthy that the first group of Soviet undergraduates to study in the U.S. consists only of science students: five will go to Yale to study chemistry, and five to the University of Maryland to study physics.[11]

• Most of male students have done their two years of military duty, which, combined with the general thrust of Soviet upbringing, makes them much more **disciplined and respectful of authority** than their American counterparts. Thus, they are reasonably likely at least to pursue scientific studies which the Soviet government wants them to pursue (rather than take un-Marxist courses in politics and

---

10 Major General M. Yasyukov, "Military Policies of the CPSU: Essence, Content," Kommunist Vooruzhennykh Sil, 1985, No.20, p.20.

11 Fred M. Hechinger, "U.S.-Soviet Unsung Gains," The New [illegible], November 3, 1987.

history), and not to divulge to Americans around them any secrets they have been entrusted with.

• In addition, most of the Soviet male undergraduate students are enrolled in **compulsory commissioned reserve officer training system**, which translates, as far as possible their professional education into a military speciality.[12] I happen to think that it is important to bring Soviet undergraduates to the United States, but it is also legitimate to remember that we are educating Soviet reserve officers at American schools.

LEGITIMIZING SOVIET HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS.

The Soviets are dissatisfied with geopolitical equality with the United States; they strive to be recognized as a moral equal of this nation. To this end, they rely heavily on concluding exchange agreements between bogus "public organizations" in the Soviet Union (even the Soviet press is now acknowledging that "voluntary assocations" in the Soviet Union, numbering thousands of members, exist only on paper and are a form of "spiritual cheating")[13] and real public voluntary organizations in the U.S. Sometimes, such exchanges are used by the Soviets to give respectability to their institutions and personalities involved in violations of human rights.

The most notorious example of the latter kind has been the exchange agreement, signed in 1985, between the **American Bar Association (ABA) and the Association of Soviet Lawyers (ASL)**. The ASL is not a working organization of Soviet lawyers but rather a special body established in order to conduct propaganda against human rights activists and Jewish refuseniks at home and whitewash Soviet violations of human rights in the West. According to Dina Kaminskaya, a former prominent Soviet defense attorney forced into exile because of her courageous defense of human rights activists, only the most "politically reliable" lawyers were invited to join the ASL.

---

12 See Mikhail Tsypkin, Soviet Reserve Officer Training System: An Assessment (Monterey, CA: Naval Postgraduate School, Department of National Security Affairs, 1984).

13 Aleksandr Vasinskiy, "Neither for Ourselves, Nor for Our Descendants," Izvestiya, July 29, 1986.

In 1979, the ASL published an anti-Semitic and anti-American White Book, portraying Soviet Jewish would-be emigres as inspired by Western "intelligence services," and American newsmen in Moscow as "CIA agents." In 1985, just at the time the ABA was signing its exchange agreement with the ASL, the latter published the second edition of the White Book. In it, the President of ASL Aleksandr Sukharev and Soviet Army General David Dragunskiy (who presides over the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee, a quasi-official body dedicated to struggle with Jewish emigration and cultural movement) praised the 1975 UN resolution equating Zionism with racism. Further, the White Book attacks religious education of Jewish children as "nationalistic," and describes the United States as a land of government-sponsored anti-Semitism.[14]

The Vice-President of ASL, Samuil Zivs (who is also the Vice-President of the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee) described the illegal exile of Dr. Andrei Sakharov to Gorky as "in full conformity with ... legal norms," although Sakharov was never charged with any crime, never faced a court of law, and was never given a chance to defend himself. Zivs described Jewish activists Anatoly Shcharansky as a paid agent of the CIA, and accused Dr. Anatoly Koryagin, a courageous critic of Soviet abuses of psychiatry, of terrorist activity! Zivs also attacked Amnesty International for "poisoning people's minds with the disinformation about the Soviet Union."[15]

The President of ASL, Aleksandr Sukharev, is the Minister of Justice of the Russian Republic (RSFSR) in the Soviet Union, and thus is directly responsible for violations of human rights and persecution of dissidents. Recently, Sukharev was criticized in the Soviet press for his indifference to violations of elementary legal norms (the right of a journalist to take notes during a court session violated by a judge.)[16]

The decision of ABA to treat Sukharev, Zivs and ASL in a collegial fashion has caused a barrage of criticism in this country. To diffuse this criticism, the ABA insists that the exchange agreement with ASL provides the American lawyers with an excellent opportunity to

---

[14] Belaya kniga (Moscow: Yuridicheskaya literatura, 1979), pp.172-230, passim; Belaya kniga (Moscow: Yuridicheskaya literatura, 1985) pp.10, 13, 58-60, 90, 249-251.

[15] Samuil Zivs, The Anatomy of Lies (Moscow: Progress, 1984), pp.103, 46, 154.

[16] "V pol'zu spravedlivosti," Literaturnaya gazeta, September 24, 1986.

press vigorously behind the scenes for improvement in human rights practices of the Soviets. An excellent illustration of feebleness of this pressure is contained in a memorandum from the ABA on a meeting between its delegation and the Soviet Chairman of the Supreme Soviet Andrei Gromyko on July 2, 1986. In the course of the meeting, **the only statement regarding human rights** made on behalf of ABA by then President William F. Falsgraf was as follows:

> President Falsgraf ... advised President Gromyko that **Jewish groups** in the United States and **Jewish members** of the American Bar Assocation are concerned about U.S.S.R.'s policy with respect to emigration to Israel. Again President Falsgraf pointed out that this is a **minority** view but a minority view held with great sincerity. (Emphasis mine-M.Ts.)

(The whole text of this memorandum can be found in the Appendix .)

Thus, the leaders of the American Bar Association had nothing more to tell the Soviets about human rights than that it is a matter of one group of Jews concerned about another group of Jews! The lesson of ABA-ASL exchanges is that once an American public organization committs itself to exchanges with a bogus Soviet organization, without much preliminary research into the background of the latter, and without much understanding of the nature of the Soviet political system and society, it is bound to be embarassed, then defend itself by claims of exaggerated achievements in their dealings with the Soviets, and stick to the agreement no matter what so as to avoid recognizing a mistake. The American public is mislead (because of the ABA's enormous repuation), while conduct by ABA leaders, such as the one exhibited at the meeting with Mr. Gromyko, can earn us only contempt from the Soviets.

A related point is that **there is no clearing house of solid background information on Soviet organizations and individuals** to which anybody who wants to initiate an exchange program can turn. It is very easy to propose another Soviet-American exchange which looks fine at first glance but contains a potential for embarassment. For instance, Senator Paul Simon praised the idea of establishing "sister university" programs between American and Soviet universities, including Moscow State University. But Moscow Univesity, like other Soviet schools, is the opposite of the American idea of free academic inquiry; in addition, the Admissions Board of Moscow State University practices **racial discrimination**

against Jews, as documented by the Moscow Helsinki Monitors group, even going as far as demanding a genealogical tree from an applicant to prove absence of "Jewish blood!"[16]

Perhaps it will be an appropriate role for the CSCE, with its tradition of multifaceted involvement in the issues of East-West contacts, and with the staff unparalleled on the Capitol Hill for expertise in Soviet affairs, to establish a clearing house of information on Soviet institutions and personalities helpful to those interested in Soviet-American exchanges.

CONCLUSIONS.

Increased Soviet-American exchanges can serve our national interest provided that a balanced policy on exchanges is exercised by the Federal Government, thatthis policy is a beneficiary of serious interest from the U.S. Congress, especially from the CSCE, and that public groups involved in Soviet-American exchanges establish cooperative relationship with both the Administration and the Congress.

Some specific policy recommendations:

• The CSCE should make hearings on Soviet-American exchanges a regular part of its work.

• The CSCE should request reports on the status of Soviet-American exchanges both from the Interagency Coordinating Committee on U.S.-Soviet Affairs (ICCUSA), which oversees all U.S. Government activities with respect of the Soviet Union, and from the Committee on Exchanges (COMEX) of the Technology Transfer Intelligence Committee (TTIC), which deals with the security aspects of Soviet-American exchanges. [18]

---

17 Senator Paul Simon, An Agenda for U.S.-Soviet Exchanges (Senate Chamber: May 21, 1986), p.3; "Discrimination against Jews Enrolling at Moscow University, 1979," Arkhiv Samizdata, No.4695, pp.1-3.

18 For details of U.S. Government decision-making process on the matters of U.S.-Soviet exchanges, see John D. Negroponte, "U.S.-Soviet Scientific Exchanges," Current Policy (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs), No.997, p.3.

• The CSCE should invite representatives of the public, involved in Soviet-American exchanges and in monitoring the human rights situation in the Soviet Union, to testify about exchange programs and their impact on human rights.

• The CSCE should establish a clearing house of information on Soviet institutions and personalities useful for those initiating new exchange programs with the Soviets. *

---

* Much of my research on U.S.-Soviet exchanges was done while I was the Salvatori Fellow in Soviet Studies at The Heritage Foundation, to which I express deep gratitude. My special thanks are to Burt Pines, Heritage's Senior Vice President for Research, and W. Bruce Weinrod, Director of Defense and Foreign Policy Studies. Needless to say, all the views expressed above are solely mine. I have also drawn quite heavily on my materials previously published in The Heritage Foundation Backgrounders Nos. 478, 510, and 537.

APPENDIX

TAB 14

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION
750 NORTH LAKE SHORE DRIVE
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60611

File

DATE July 2, 1986

FROM David J.A. Hayes, Jr. JH

SUBJECT Meeting with Andrei A. Gromyko, President of the Presidents of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. in the Kremlin Palace Tuesday, May 27, 1986

9/10 Paul said Bill Burt ... p.3

On Tuesday morning at 10:00 a.m., the American Bar Association delegation consisting of President and Mrs. William W. Falsgraf, Eugene C. Thomas, Allen E. Brennecke, Weymen I. Lundquist, Thomas H. Gonser and David J.A. Hayes, Jr. met in the Catherine Hall of the Kremlin Palace with President Andrei A. Gromyko and four of his aides. We were accompanied by President Alexander Y. Sukharev of the ASL and by Vasilay A. Valsihin who acted as an interpreter.

President Gromyko welcomed the group to the USSR and specifically to the Kremlin Palace. President Gromyko then called upon President Falsgraf. President Falsgraf then developed three themes namely: 1) our perception of the lack of independence of the lawyer in the USSR, 2) our extreme concern about human rights throughout the world, 3) and the future of Soviet/American relations.

First, said President Falsgraf most of the lawyers of the American Bar Association favored a relationship with the Association of Soviet Lawyers and favored the exchange of delegations. American lawyers, however, do not understand how Soviet lawyers practice law and assume that there is a lack of independence on the part of the Soviet lawyer. Many in the USA feel that in the representation of clients the first duty of the attorney in the USSR is to the state and only secondly to the client.

President Falsgraf then moved on to his second point and advised President Gromyko that Jewish groups in the United States and Jewish members of the American Bar Association are concerned about U.S.S.R.'s policy with respect to emigration to Israel. Again, President Falsgraf pointed out that this is a minority view but a minority view that is held with great sincerity. We all recall, he commented, the suffering of the Jewish people in Europe in World War II and it is important that they have a homeland and a sanctuary as a result of all this suffering.

MEMORANDUM

File
Page Two
July 2, 1986

With respect to Soviet-American relations, President Falsgraf commented that as a personal view he thought that the relationship between the USA and the USSR is now at its best level in his lifetime. He commented that President Gromyko would certainly remember when it was not as good as it is today and that both sides should take every opportunity to promote better relations between the two nations.

President Gromyko responded, handling the Jewish emigration issue very carefully. He commented first that it was useful to explore this issue, yet once again, and stated with considerable forcefulness that all national groups have equal rights in the USSR and all citizens have equal rights and responsibilities. He suggested that misleading editorials in the Western and particularly in the United States media have created a misunderstanding that the American Jewish groups have with respect to Soviet policy. President Gromyko noted that the policy of the Tsars has long been repudiated by the USSR in fact, the Anti-Jewish Policies of the Tsars led in part to the Revolution in 1917. In the 1970s he continued, massive numbers of Jews left the Soviet Union to be reunited with their families in Israel, Western Europe or the United States. They are always reprimanded these days for not letting these emigrants go but such is not the fact. President Gromyko said that they look at every application as a single case and make judgements based on this single case.

President Gromyko then advised the delegation that there were limitations of this emigration policy that related to national security questions. No emigration permits can be issued for a specific period of time to a person that has worked in a national security industry; when that person took the position he signed a permit which indicated he would not seek emigration for a specified amount of time. He confided though that there were very few of these cases. He stated that there were many Jewish people who simply do not want to leave the Soviet Union yet they are on lists held by various American groups. President Gromyko said it was not their policy purpose to stop the flow of Jewish emigrants to Israel.

There is a problem said President Gromyko that many of the emigrants who have left to go to Israel and Western Europe want to return to the Soviet Union. The Soviets do process these applications to come back though they really don't want these people back because most of them are unhappy and unstable people.

MEMORANDUM

File
Page Three
July 2, 1986

Many Soviets believe than many of the prospective Jewish emigrants are strongly pro-Israel and hence are opposed to Soviet policy in the Middle East. Soviets treat these persons with deep suspicion.

The Soviets are concerned about Israel's posture with the Syrians and with the Palestinans and although they do not officially condemn Israel for its policies, they are not policies that promote world peace. President Gromyko then concluded his discussion of Jewish emigration stating that he would have brought up the subject if President Falsgraf had not brought it up.

Then President Gromyko commented that political stability is terribly important. The whole world counts on the relationship of the USA and USSR returning to what it was during World War II. The present relationships between our two countries are not what we would like; there is too much tension present. The hope of Geneva continues and we hope that there will be no war and neither nation can have military superiority over the other. It seems to be, said President Gromyko, that the practical actions of the United States government have not been in accordance recently with the spirit of Geneva. More and more nuclear arms are being made by the United States and outer space will soon be overburdened with nuclear weapons. The Soviets are very much opposed to nuclear weapons in outer space and have proposed many times that there be no nuclear arms in space. We both also need to reduce nuclear warheads and we have recently proposed that to President Reagan.

We must reduce arms, continued President Gromyko; if the arms race does not stop, something awful will most certainly happen. Their recent experience at the Chernobyl nuclear power plant shows how dangerous nuclear weapons can be. Nuclear power must at all times be used for peace.

President Gromyko then commented that trade and cultural visits such as the ABA visits to the Soviet Union are very important and it is an excellent working proposition to have people-to-people contact.

President-Elect Eugene C. Thomas then commented that the USA and the USSR are two great countries, especially over the last forty years. This greatness suggested comes from achievement not from just size. The great powers that won the war must win the peace and above all we need to have a stability in our relationships.

MEMORANDUM

File
Page Four
July 2, 1986

Mr. Thomas stated that his point dealt with the role of the lawyer in the USSR and USA. Lawyers represent their clients as well as the public interest, and making the law work for the accomplishment of public policy is very important. Lawyers common concerns are people and the public interest. Lawyers are expert in making the law work to its public policy ends. The hope of our exchange was that it might bring lawyers of our two countries together in a search for peace and prosperity. Terrorism and environmental problems resolving from nuclear accidents, immigration, all of these make news stories, but these problems also lend themselves to study by legal scholars that all might benefit. We can exchange and develop dialogue about these legal problems. These types of pursuits can develop a more positive attitude toward lawyers in each country and help to prevent fear and mistrust. Power stems from our American people. The flow of public opinion to the law will greatly aid all of us.

President Gromyko complimented President-Elect Thomas on his comments and stated our first client is justice in the law. The ABA, President Gromyko said, can help to influence American policy makers-only granite would not hear the ABA. Regrettably, he said, President Reagan's ideas are not in conformity with peace and control of nuclear weapons. The cemetery quietness is not what the Soviets want. What they do want is no barriers between purely legal items between our two countries. The dome is over the arena and we must move forward.

DJAH:dmb
3979k/4-7

Chairman HOYER. At this time I recognize Dr. Jeremy Stone. Dr. Stone is the Director of the Federation of American Scientists, and has been since 1970.

The Federation has a membership of more than 5,000 scientists and is dedicated to ending the nuclear arms race. The Federation has also worked on the issues of human rights and energy conservation.

Most importantly to the subject matter of this hearing, the Federation has published a booklet called "Raising the Rate of Exchange," which encourages legislators to travel to the Soviet Union.

We appreciate very much, Mr. Stone, your being with us and look forward to your testimony.

Mr. STONE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, if the statement with attachments could be submitted in your record, then I would just avoid reading it and speak from it.

Chairman HOYER. Without objection your testimony as prepared will be included in the record at this time.

STATEMENT OF JEREMY STONE

Mr. STONE. Mr. Chairman, our organization is the oldest organization in the world working on the nuclear war matter, started by the original atomic scientists in 1945.

But after about 20 years of working on the arms race it occurred to us that if the Congressmen didn't visit the Soviet Union and if Soviet officials didn't come here, there was little chance of making a dent in the problem of nuclear war.

And so we have been working for 20 years to try to get Congressmen and Senators to visit the object of their anxiety and to see first hand what so much money was being spent on.

When I arrived here on Capitol Hill in 1969, the situation was so bad in this respect that the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe, which was the subcommittee with direct responsibility for the Soviet Union, had never been there. And the ratio of Senators that had been there was about 40 percent; in the House of Representatives it was about, perhaps, 15 percent.

We started complaining about it and Senator Gravel introduced a bill which passed the Senate, but was killed in the House, that would have paid the way of all Senators and Congressmen who had not been to the Soviet Union to go for—Mr. Simpkin will be pleased to hear—at least 3 weeks. It also included provisions for the governors and the 100 largest mayors.

At that time we would have been prepared to take it any way we could get it.

Chairman HOYER. Any way you could get it, right?

Mr. STONE. At that time I might add, Senator Dole was the main opponent of this on the Senate floor. But after a trip to the Soviet Union some years later, he introduced, at a later stage, another version of this same approach we had in 1969. We think the Congressmen and Senators really should go and see it.

The ratios are not much better though than they were in 1969, about 50 percent of the Senators have gone now, and maybe 25 percent of the House.

Chairman HOYER. Mr. Stone, let me interject. When you say "maybe," do you have any statistics?

Mr. STONE. Now, wait, we have the exact statistics. Actually, it's 50 percent of the Senate and 33 percent in the House.

We have on the cover of the booklet that you were referring to the names of all the Senators and all the Congressmen who have taken the trouble to go.

We're telling constituents all over the country to ask their Senator or Congressman, if he is not on this list, "have you ever been there?" and if he says "no," to ask him: "How can you be sure that your views are well considered?" We would like, in this way, to exert a polite pressure on Congressmen and Senators to take the trouble despite their busy schedule to actually visit the Soviet Union.

We have no illusions that Congressmen will understand the Soviet Union thoroughly after the very short visit that they normally undertake. But we believe that even short visits to the Soviet Union will have an effect on the psyches and intellects of American Congressmen and Senators.

In our opinion, after studying trip reports for 200 years, we think that the effect that Russia has on Western visitors—by and large and on the whole—is that the "right" is tranquilized and the "left" disillusioned.

On the whole, I agree with what Senator Gravel said in 1969, that people visiting a country like the Soviet Union, and like Russia before it, tend to trust it less when they come back, but also to fear it less. They see the poverty and fear of war and they are therefore less apt to exaggerate the size of the real danger.

At the same time, they see clearly the intellectual suffocation. They don't come away thinking that the Soviet Union or Russia is just like America. There is therefore a greater realism that comes into the heads of Americans of all political persuasions when they visit that country.

I'm a little more speculative on the reverse effect. But I would speculate that, when the Russians come here, on the whole they fear us more and trust us more. They see the size of the economy, and the strength of the United States in its economic terms just as we see the relative poverty of the Soviet Union. They thus see the great danger of fooling around with a GNP this large. But, at the same time, I think they see the contrast to the propaganda that Mr. Tsypkin was referring to. They see that the United States is not focused 100 percent of its time on destroying the Soviet Union.

So, I think these visits have a good effect in general terms, as history has counseled us. But with regard to the United States and the Soviet Union, I think they also have a very good effect in specific concrete ways.

U.S. visits to China, and the Chinese official visits to the United States, are greatly outdistancing the exchanges the United States has with the Soviet Union. I don't feel this is healthy. The Chinese will understand us much better than the Soviets, and we will understand China much better than we understand the Soviet Union.

I met with the chief of staff of the State Council in China in 1986, and I asked him, how many of your 176 superiors have been to the United States? And he said with a laugh, "oh, almost all.

That's why they never accept the staff's ideas." In other words, they came over here and got their own ideas.

This is, by the way, one of the reasons why Soviet Government is very reluctant to send more of its high officials here. They don't want a large number of their officials intruding on what is a monopoly of a few officials who control Soviet foreign affairs.

So prying Soviet officials into the West, I consider a very important task. Only about 5 percent of their 1,500 parliamentarians have been here. I think we could do well to try to lure more of them here.

I have urged Soviet officials to ask Gorbachev whether he thinks his reforms will be accepted in the Soviet Union if so few of his high officials have seen that great outdistancing of the Soviet Union by the West, with which Gorbachev is trying to grapple. Gorbachev would be well advised to send more officials here, and at some point he may realize that, especially after his visit.

And at that point, the Helsinki Commission could play a very useful role I think in making it possible to have much larger exchanges of parliamentarians.

I want to turn now to this question of what has been holding up parliamentary exchange. I spoke to Tolkunov, who some of you may know, who is the head of the House of Represenatives there. I asked him a few years ago what was holding up all these exchanges. He said he had talked to Senator Mike Mansfield in 1974 and wanted a special parliamentary group set up here to facilitate the exchanges. Mansfield had told him "we can't do that because we do it with Canada and Mexico, but if we did it with other countries we'd have to do it with everybody." Tolkunov took that, I think, as a polite excuse.

I do too. I point out in my testimony that the Soviet Union, like Mexico and Canada, borders on the United States through the Bering Straits, and we could make an exception for it, if we wanted.

But the basic problem that's confounding parliamentary exchanges is that our side doesn't want to legitimatize their parliament, and their side would like to have their parliament legitimatized.

From my point of view, this is a real red herring. I would like the parliamentarians on our side to visit the Soviet Union and I don't care whether they speak to their counterparts, or legitimatize the Soviet parliament, and vice versa, I'd like to have the Soviet parliamentarians come here whether or not they talk to American Parliamentarians and whether or not it's done through a parliamentary exchange.

In fact, the kind of parliamentary exchange we are not interested in is "once a year high level" visits between the two parliaments to signal some sort of parliamentary relationship. These don't expose large numbers of parliamentarians who haven't been there.

So some method should be found, and I appeal to the Commission to help us find it, whereby large numbers of the parliamentarians on the two sides that haven't been there would get some firsthand exposure. I want to emphasize, in this connection, that their parliament—looked at as a collection of individuals—is more influential

in Soviet life than our parliament. It should not be looked upon as just a rubber stamp thing just because it never has had dissenting votes. It *is* a rubber stamp. But it has in it all the high officials of Soviet life.

For example, it has 85 percent of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in the parliament. It has 50 high-ranking KGB generals. We don't have generals, we don't have leading political party figures in our parliament. They have the First Secretary of all their regions. All these people, with the exception of the milk maids and the common folk thrown in to give it a classless quality, are a vast majority of the people you'd want to talk to about what the heck is going on in the Soviet Union.

So I think getting their parliamentarians over here is very important, even if you don't like the absence of democracy inside their parliament. And I would hope that a political quarrel over the legitimacy of these links wouldn't interfere with getting the parliamentarians here.

At one point we retained former Under Secretary of State Benjamin Reed, whom the committee may know, to check around town and see if we couldn't help set up an organization that would facilitate these large-scale exchanges.

We wanted something that would do for the Soviet Union what the Committee on United States-China Relations has done for China, something that would facilitate exchanges of elites between the societies. And Secretary Reed found tremendous support all over Washington for something like this. But on the Soviet side we ran into difficulties.

We wanted to get some approval on the Soviet side before we took the trouble to set this up. We discovered that they were all hung up on having special direct relations with the Congress, weren't sure they were going to be sending a lot of people, and thus took the attitude, "OK, set it up if you want." But they weren't about to give us any feeling that it would be related to redoubled efforts on their part to use it.

Now another approach that we've tried which the committee might help us on, and I think might be very effective on, is to try to get committee-to-committee exchanges. There, the members traveling would have some point of common contact and conversation.

For example, we arranged a luncheon with the Chairman of the Energy Committee of one of the Houses of the Soviet Parliament, Academician E.P. Velikhov with Congressman Dingell. Velikhov invited Dingell to send his whole committee to Russia. And that whole committee exchange would have taken place except that Secretary Weinberger, at the last minute, refused the House committee the right to use a military aircraft and the exchange fell apart.

So I think that there is room for some committee-to-committee exchanges. But, again, we're not concerned whether these parliamentarians talk to each other. We're just concerned about whether they see the other society as best they can.

In this connection, we're very much in support of Congressman Udall's Resolution 283, which he's offered with Congresswoman Schroeder. This is similar to a resolution that Senator Dole introduced before he became the Majority Leader and endorses at least

the concept of travel, although it doesn't appropriate the money which Senator Gravel was eager to do 20 years ago.

Finally, I want to comment on one part of the testimony that was given before me by Professor Tsypkin. He understands Soviet life quite well. But I feel that I have some understanding of American life. In trying to figure out the role the Commission should play it's necessary to evaluate both the Soviet political structure and the U.S. political structure. It is true that it would be useful, in some ways, to know exactly who are all these Soviet guys that Americans are dealing with. But depending on how you did it, it could have an unfortunate effect in American political life.

You could turn the Helsinki Commission into a kind of House Un-American Activities Committee that would show that everybody we were dealing with in the Soviet Union was a hard-core Commie, who had said a lot of outrageous things—when he was, of course, following their often outrageous line.

For example, when these people return, they don't talk about the United States the way they did see it. That's doing what comes naturally for people who want careers in the Soviet bureaucracy. When this man, whom Professor Tsypkin quoted, and attacked Sakharov by saying Sakharov had been dealt with according to legal norms, that was simply what everybody there was saying except Sakharov.

When I talked to Mrs. Bonner in a secret meeting in 1983 in the U.S. Embassy, she said to me, "you have to understand that a dissident in Russia is like a miracle." And of course Elena is right. There aren't a lot of people wandering around saying Sakharov "wasn't" treated according to legal norms.

So if this list got out of control in the U.S. side, you could easily smear all the exchanges that might take place by saying they were taking place with a lot of very disreputable characters over there.

So, I do have reservations about how that proposal might be carried out. But anyway, the bottom line which all the witnesses agree on here today is that these exchanges are very valuable.

One conclusion I want to leave the committee with is this: People-to-people exchanges have been going on for a long time and, speaking as a mathematician, they aren't going to make any difference because you'll never get the ratios up high enough to really change the structures of the two societies. I've overstated when I say it won't make "any" difference, but they won't make any difference, I want to say, compared to the effect of getting the leaderships of these two societies traveling.

You can make more hay by inducing, requiring and pressuring a small group of elites on our side, and on their side, to make these trips and, with much less expense and much less trouble, inject more reality into the policies of both societies that you could do by flogging away for decades on people-to-people exchanges. That's the point our organization has been working on for the last 20 years.

Thank you.

Calendar No. 775

91ST CONGRESS, 2d Session | SENATE | REPORT No. 91-768

STONE MOUNTAIN MEMORIAL MEDALS

APRIL 23, 1970.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3435]

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the bill (S. 3435) to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the completion of the carvings on Stone Mountain, Ga., depicting heroes of the Confederacy having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to strike and furnish to the Stone Mountain Memorial Foundation not more than 500,000 medals in quantities of not less than 2,000, in commemoration of the completion of the carvings on Stone Mountain, Ga., depicting heroes of the Confederacy. No medals shall be manufactured after December 31, 1971.

The design of the medals, including emblems, devices, and inscriptions to be determined by the association subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. The medals struck under this bill shall be of such sizes and of such metals as may be determined by the Secretary in consultation with the association. The medals will be minted at no cost to the United States since security must be furnished satisfactory to the Secretary to indemnify the United States of all costs of the medals.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

On the recommendation of the Department of the Treasury, a committee amendment was adopted limiting the number of medals which may be struck under this bill. Upon the recommendation of the chief sponsor of this bill, Senator Talmadge, the number was placed at not more than 500,000.

in subsection (a) shall hereafter be considered to be references to the appropriate provisions of [this Act] *this title.*

TITLE II—UNITED STATES-UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS POLITICAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

SEC. 201. It is the purpose of this title to promote greater understanding between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by providing for the exchange of governmental officials of those nations.

SEC. 202. For the purposes of this title—

(1) "elected official" means—

(A) a Member of the House of Representatives or the Senate;

(B) the Governor of any of the several States of the United States;

(C) the mayor or, if no mayor, the head of the governing body, of (i) the capital city of each State of the United States, and (ii) the largest city in each such State other than the capital city;

(D) the chief presiding officer of each house of a State legislature; and

(E) the majority leader and the minority leader of each house of a State legislature;

(2) "Soviet Union" means the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

(3) "program" means the United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Political Exchange Program;

(4) "Secretary" means the Secretary of State; and

(5) "Committee" means the Advisory Committee on the United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Political Exchange Program.

SEC. 203. (a) The Secretary is authorized to conduct a United States-Soviet Union Political Exchange Program, which shall provide for the following:

(1) Each person who is an elected official on the date of enactment of this title and the spouse of each such official if traveling with the elected official, shall be eligible, while still holding his elected office, to be paid, in accordance with priorities established by the Committee and in accordance with paragraph (4) of this subsection, for one trip abroad which includes travel to the Soviet Union and which is made within five years after the date of enactment of this title.

(2) Any successor in office of an elected official referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, and the spouse of such successor, is eligible, while serving in such office as a successor, to be paid, in accordance with priorities established by the Committee and in accordance with paragraph (4) of this subsection, for one trip abroad which includes travel to the Soviet Union which is made within five years after the date of enactment of this title.

(3) The total number of elected officials and their successors eligible for payment for travel under the provisions of this title shall not exceed one thousand.

(4) Payment under this section shall not exceed the round trip cost by air of the elected official and accompanying spouse between

his State of residence or Washington, District of Columbia, to any place in the Soviet Union, the cost of travel within the Soviet Union and an allowance of $50 a day for the elected official not to exceed fourteen days and $20 a day for an accompanying spouse.

(5) Prior to departure from the United States and in order to receive a payment authorized by this subsection, each elected official or successor in office, and accompanying spouse, shall receive a briefing about the Soviet Union and the relations of the United States with the Soviet Union. The briefing shall be conducted by the Department of State after consultation and in cooperation with the Committee.

(b)(1) As a part of the program, the Secretary, after consultation with the Committee, and with the approval of the President, may—

(A) pay for the cost of arranging the itinerary of not to exceed 1,000 officials of the Supreme Soviet, the Council of Ministers, the Central Committee of the Soviet Union, the principal officials of the constituent republics of the Soviet Union, the heads of the governing bodies of the 100 largest cities of the Soviet Union, and the spouses of such officials, traveling to the United States; and

(B) conclude any necessary arrangement with the Soviet Union to carry out the provisions of this title, and such arrangements may provide, on a reciprocal basis, for the payment of expenditures by the government of the nation where the expenditures are incurred.

(2) No travel to the Soviet Union by elected officials under subsection (a) shall be dependent upon the conclusion of any agreement or arrangement under this subsection.

Sec. 204. In order to carry out the provisions of this title, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to obtain the services of experts and consultants in accordance with the provisions of section 3109 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) to enter into contracts or other arrangments, or modifications thereof, without legal consideration, without performance or other bonds, and without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U.S.C. 5) or other provisions of law relating to competitive bidding;

(3) to make advance, progress, and other payments deemed necessary under this title without regard to the provisions of section 3648 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529);

(4) to furnish to the Committee, to the maximum extent practicable, such staff, office facilities, furniture, equipment, and supplies as the Chairman considers necessary to carry out the functions of the Committee;

(5) to determine, in consultation with the Committee, the character of and the necessity for obligations and expenditures under the program, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, subject to the provisions of this title; and

(6) to take such other action as may be necessary.

Sec. 205. (a) There is hereby established an Advisory Committee on the United States-Union of Soviet Socialist Republics Political Exchange Program.

(b) The Committee shall be composed of not to exceed five Members appointed as follows:

(1) Three Members of the Congress, appointed as follows:

(A) One Member of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate;

(B) One Member of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(C) One Member from either House of Congress appointed by agreement of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and

(2) not to exceed two other persons, chosen from among persons who are (A) former United States Ambassadors to the Soviet Union, or (B) otherwise qualified by training or experience as authorities with respect to the Soviet Union or exchanges with the Soviet Union, to be appointed by the President and to serve at his pleasure.

(c) The Committee shall elect a Chairman from among its members.

(d) The Committee is authorized to adopt such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary to carry out the authority conferred upon it by this section.

(e) The Committee shall establish priorities with respect to payments to elected officials for trips abroad under the program and shall consult with, and make recommendations to, the Secretary of State, in connection with the program, with respect to—

(1) itineraries, interpreters, the exchange of currencies, and other related details of travel under such program;

(2) provisions to accommodate the personal and professional interests of persons participating in the program;

(3) matters to be covered in the briefing administered by the Secretary under the program; and

(4) such other matters as the Committee deems necessary to conduct the program.

(f) The Committee shall submit a report 3 years after the date of enactment of this title evaluating the program, giving particular attention to means by which it might be improved and making such findings and recommendations as it deems necessary. The Committee shall submit a final report not later than 5 years after such date.

SEC. 206. Unless legislation is enacted providing otherwise, the program shall terminate and the Committee shall cease to exist 90 days after the Committee submits its final report.

SEC. 207. In order to carry out this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $5,000,000 to remain available until expended.

SEC. 208. This title shall take effect on the 1st day of February 1971.

STANDING COMMISSIONS
OF THE
SUPREME SOVIET
(and equivalent committees of the U.S.Congress)

Agro-industrial Complex
+ Senate Agricultural
+ House Agricultural

Budget and Planning
+ Senate Finance
+ House Budget; House Government Operations

Communal Housing and Municipal Economy
+ Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
+ House Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs

Conservation and Utilization of Natural Resources
+ Senate Environment and Public Works
+ House Interior and Insular Affairs

Construction and Building Materials Industry
+ Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs
+ House Public Works and Transportation

Consumer Goods and Trade
+ Senate Commerce, Science and Transportation
+ House Energy and Commerce

Credentials
+ Senate Rules and Administration
+ House Adminstration; House Standards of Official Conduct

Energy
+ Senate Energy and Natural Resources
+ House Energy and Commerce

Foreign Affairs
+ Senate Foreign Relations
+ House Foreign Affairs

Health and Social Security
+ Senate Labor and Human Resources

Industry
+ Senate Commerce, Science, and Technology
+ House Energy and Commerce, House Small Business

Legislative Proposals
+ Senate Appropriations
+ House Appropriations, House Ways and Means, House Rules

Maternity, Child Development, and the Work and Life of Women
+ Senate Labor and Human Resources
+ House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families

Public Education and Culture
+ Senate Labor and Human Resources
+ House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families

Science and Technology
+ Senate Commerce, Science, Transportation
+ House Science and Technology

Transport and Communications
+ Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation
+ House Public Works and Transportation

Youth Affairs
+ Senate Labor and Human Resources
+ House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families

Supreme Soviet Standing Commission Chairmen -- June, 1987

		Position		Date of Birth
Council of the Union				
(Sovet Soyuza Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR)				
Chairman	**Telkunov**, Lev Nikolayevich	el	11 Apr 84	22 Jan 19
Deputy Chairmen	**Gribkyavichus**, Pyatras Pyatrovich	el	18 Apr 79	19 Jul 24
	Kulova, Ogulidzhennet Sopuyevna	el	11 Apr 84	
	Mollkov, Arif Dzhangirovich	el	18 Nov 84	
	Narmatova, Khayrinis Abdinabiyevna	el	11 Apr 84	
	Paton, Boris Yevgen'yevich, *D.Tech.S.*	el	02 Aug 66	27 Nov 18
Agroindustrial Complex Commission				
Chairman	**Ponomarev**, Aleksey Filippovich	el	28 Nov 85	20 Aug 30
Budget and Planning Commission				
Chairman	**Masol**, Vitaliy Andreyevich	el	17 Jun 83	1928
Communal Housing and Municipal Economy Commission				
Chairman	**Kazupov**, Boris Vsevolodovich	el	25 Nov 71	Jul 19
Conservation and Utilization of Natural Resources Commission				
Chairman	**Gvozdo**, Semen Kuz'mich	el	12 Apr 84	10 Mar 34
Construction and Construction Materials Industry Commission				
Chairman	**Bagirov**, Kyamran Mamed ogly	el	12 Apr 84	Jan 33
Consumer Goods and Services Commission				
Chairman	**Taheyev**, Fikryat Akhmedzhanovich	el	18 Nov 86	28 Mar 28
Credentials Commission				
Chairman	**Demirchyan**, Karen Seropovich	el	18 Apr 79	17 Apr 32
Energy Commission				
Chairman	**Gorshkov**, Leonid Aleksandrovich	el	12 Apr 84	Jul 30
Foreign Affairs Commission				
Chairman	**Ligachev**, Yegor Kuz'mich	el	02 Jul 85	29 Nov 20
Health and Social Security Commission				
Chairman	**Blokhina**, Irina Nikolayevna	el	25 Jul 74	21 Apr 21
Industrial Commission				
Chairman	**Vayno**, Karl Genrikhovich	el	18 Apr 79	26 May 23
Legislative Proposals Commission				
Chairman	**Razumovskiy**, Georgiy Petrovich	el	28 Nov 85	19 Jan 36
Maternity, Child Development, and the Work and Life of Women Commission				
Chairman	**Pukhova**, Zoya Pavlovna	el	18 Apr 79	24 Sep 36
Public Education and Culture Commission				
Chairman	**Salykov**, Kakimbek Salykovich	el	28 Nov 85	1932
Science and Technology Commission				
Chairman	**Glushko**, Igor' Alekseyevich, *D.Tech.S.*	el	18 Apr 79	21 Jan 14
Transport and Communications Commission				
Chairman	**Klimenko**, Ivan Yefimovich, *C.Econ.S.*	el	26 Jul 74	28 Nov 21
Youth Affairs Commission				
Chairman	**Lagunov**, Anatoliy Alekseyevich, *D.PM.S.*	el	12 Apr 84	30 Dec 26
Council of Nationalities				
(Sovet Natsional'nostey Verkhovnogo Soveta SSSR)				
Chairman	**Voss**, August Eduardovich, *C.Econ.S.*	el	11 Apr 84	30 Oct 16
Deputy Chairmen	**Adem-Yumpov**, Tyulegen Dyusembayevich	el	11 Apr 84	
	Bondarev, Yuriy Vasil'yevich	el	11 Apr 84	15 Mar 24
	Lobacheva, Yeva Yakovlevna	el	11 Apr 84	
	Tairova, Farogat	el	11 Apr 84	
Agroindustrial Complex Commission				
Chairman	**Mazgovoy**, Ivan Alekseyevich	el	12 Apr 84	Sep 27
Deputy Chairman	**Nikanov**, Viktor Petrovich	id	27 Sep 85	28 Feb 29
Budget and Planning Commission				
Chairman	**Maslyukov**, Nikolay Ivanovich	el	26 Jul 74	1921

		Position	Date of Birth	
Council of Nationalities (Cont.)				
Communal Housing and Municipal Economy Commission				
Chairman	**Zgurskiy**, Valentin Arsent'yevich	el	11 Apr 84	1927
Deputy Chairman	**Znamenskiy**, Yu. S.	id	13 Sep 86	
Conservation and Utilization of Natural Resources Commission				
Chairman	**Grebenyuk**, Vasiliy Andreyevich	el	11 Apr 84	Sep 24
Construction and Construction Materials Industry Commission				
Chairman	**Chitanava**, Nodar Ambrosiyevich	el	18 Apr 79	10 Mar 35
Consumer Goods and Services Commission				
Chairman	**Bartoshevich**, Gennadiy Georgiyevich	el	11 Apr 84	Sep 34
Credentials Commission				
Chairman	**Miroshkin**, Oleg Semenovich	el	11 Apr 84	01 Jan 28
Energy Commission				
Chairman	**Velikhov**, Yevgeniy Pavlovich, *D.PM.S.*	el	11 Apr 84	02 Feb 35
Foreign Affairs Commission				
Chairman	**Dobrynin**, Anatoliy Fedorovich	el	18 Jun 86	16 Nov 19
Health and Social Security Commission				
Chairman	**Makhmudova**, Naima Makhmudovna	el	11 Apr 84	1928
Industrial Commission				
Chairman	**Kachalovskiy**, Yevgeniy Viktorovich	el	19 Jun 86	1926
Legislative Proposals Commission				
Chairman	**Mironov**, Vasiliy Petrovich	el	11 Apr 84	Jan 25
Maternity, Child Development, and the Work and Life of Women Commission				
Chairman	**Gellert**, Natal'ya Vladimirovna	el	19 Jun 86	1953
Public Education and Culture Commission				
Chairman	**Fedoseyev**, Petr Nikolayevich, *D.Phil.S.*	el	14 Jul 70	22 Aug 08
Science and Technology Commission				
Chairman	**Kotel'nikov**, Vladimir Aleksandrovich, *D.Tech.S.*	el	24 Jun 80	06 Sep 08
Transport and Communications Commission				
Chairman	**Dzhabbarov**, Ismail Dzhabbarovich	el	11 Apr 84	1932
Youth Affairs Commission				
Chairman	**Pugo**, Boris Karlovich	el	28 Nov 85	19 Feb 37
USSR Parliamentary Group				
(Parlamentskaya gruppa SSSR)				
Chairman	**Tolkunov**, Lev Nikolayevich	id	10 Jun 85	22 Jan 19
First Deputy Chairman	**Voss**, Avgust Eduardovich, *C.Econ.S.*	id	08 Aug 85	30 Oct 16
Deputy Chairmen	**Izrael'**, Yuriy Antoniyevich, *D.PM.S.*	id	16 Dec 85	15 May 30
	Yeliseyev, A. S.	id	20 Nov 86	
	Zagladin, Vadim Valentinovich	id	18 Sep 79	23 Jun 27

1985

Makeup of Sample Standing Committee

Foreign Affairs Committee
Council of the Union

Chairman	
Gorbachev, Mikhail Sergevich	Secretary, USSR Party Central Committee (in charge of ideology and personnel)
Deputy Chairman	
Rakhmanin, Oleg Borisovich	First Deputy Head, Socialist Countries Department, USSR Party Central Committee
Secretary	
Zagladin, Vadim Valentinovich	First Deputy Head, International Department, USSR Party Central Committee
Members	
Akhromeyev, Sergei Fyodorovich	First Deputy Head, General Staff, Soviet Armed Forces (Marshal)
Aleksandrov-Agentov, Andrei Mikhailovich	Responsible official, USSR Party Central Committee (Andropov's foreign policy adviser)
Ambartsumyan, Viktor Amazaspovich	President, Republican Academy of Sciences, Armenia
Ashuraliyev, Rashid	First Secretary, Samarkand Province Party Committee, Uzbekistan
Chyorny, Semyon Vladimirovich	Steelworker, Makeyevka Metallurgical Combine, Donetsk Province
Dashko, Nikolai Grigoryevich	Leader, Construction brigade, Kherson Industrial Construction Combine, Kherson Province
Dikanbayeva, Gulnaia Orazbekovna	Sewing-machine operator, Alma-Ata Garment Production Association, Alma-Ata Province
Dobrik, Viktor Fyodorovich	First Secretary, Lvov Province Party Committee, Ukraine
Gadoyeva, Sharofat Boltayevna	Teacher, Secondary school, Bukhara Province
Gapurov, Mukhamednazov Gapurovich	First Secretary, Republican Party Central Committee, Turkmenia
Goncharenko, Boris Trofimovich	First Secretary, Voroshilovgrad Province, Ukraine
Gromova, Maria Sergeyevna	Worker (Peasant), State farm, Moscow Province
Ibragimov, Mirza Azhdar ogly	Writer, & Chairman, Republican Union of Writers, Azerbaidzhan

Kornyienko, Georgy Markovich	First Deputy Minister, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs
Kosolapov, Richard Ivanovich	Chief editor, magazine, Kommunist (Organ of Party Central Committee)
Koshevnikov, Vadim Mikhailovich	Editor, literary magazine, Znamya, and Secretary, USSR Union of Writers
Kruglova, Zinaida Mikhailovna	Chairman, Presidium, Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries
Liventsov, Vasily Andreyevich	First Secretary, Aktyubinsk Province Party Committee, Kazakhstan
Losev, Sergei Andreyevich	General Director, USSR Telegraph Agency (TASS)
Markov, Georgy Mokeyevich	Writer, & First Secretary, USSR Union of Writers
Mikulich, Vladimir Andreyevich	First Secretary, Minsk Province Party Committee, Belorussia
Orlova, Natalya Vladimirovna	Loom operator, Trekhgornaya Manufaktura Cotton Combine, Moscow City
Polaznov, Nikolai Alekseyevich	Chairman, Collective farm, Kalinin Province
Popov, Leonid Ivanovich	USSR Pilot-Cosmonaut (Colonel)
Popov, Nikolai Ivanovich	Chairman, Executive Committee, Leningrad Province Soviet
Romanin, Dmitry Vasilyevich	First Secretary, Kaliningrad Province Party Committee, RSFSR
Shamyakin, Ivan Petrovich	Editor-in-Chief, Belorussian Soviet Encyclopedia
Shitikov, Aleksei Pavlovich	Pensioneer (At time of election, was Chairman Council of Union, Supreme Soviet)
Telepnev, Pyotr Maksimovich	First Secretary, Arkhangelsk Province Party Committee, RSFSR
Yepishev, Aleksei Alekseyevich	Head, Main Political Administration, Soviet Armed Forces (General of the army)
Zagrebelny, Pavel Arkhipovich	Writer, & First Secretary Republican Union of Writers, Ukraine
Zakharov, Ivan Vasilyevich	Leader, Fitters' brigade, Kirov Production Association, Leningrad

1985

Makeup of Sample Standing Committee

Energy Committee
Council of Nationalities

Chairman	
Velikhov, Yevgeny Pavlovich	Vice President, USSR Academy of Sciences
Deputy Chairman	
Abasov, Kurban Abas Kuli ogly	Director, Caspian Sea Petroleum and Gas Production, Azerbaidzhan
Secretary	
Kuldzhagazov, Khodzhamamed	Operator, Nebit-Dag Petroleum Administration, Turkmenia
Members	
Abdukadyrov, Abdugany Karatayevich	Leader, Stope miners' brigade, Kyzyl-Kia Mining Administration, Kirgizia
Abdurashitov, Shamil Rakhimovich	Manager, Bashkir Regional Power Administration, Bashkir Autonomous Republic
Agraba, Nazi Kochiyevna	Worker, Sukhumi Instrument Plant, Abkhaz Autonomous Republic
Bokagaev, Oraz	Leader, Boilermakers' brigade, Ashkhabad Petroleum Machinery Plant, Turkmenia
Dmitriyev, Valentin Ivanovich	Second Secretary, Republican Party Central Committee, Latvia
Guryev, Vyacheslav Iosifovich	Leader, Welders' brigade, Construction Administration, Chuvash Autonomous Republic
Ibragimov, Gusein Rustam ogly	Driller, Kaani Offshore Drilling Administration, Azerbaidzhan
Jasciuviciene, Angele Ionova	Punch-press operator, Alytusi Refrigerator Plant, Lithuania
Karpenko, Tamara Pavlovna	Optical worker, Minsk Machinery Plant, Belorussia
Ketryan, Oksana Vitalyevna	Leader, Operators' brigade, Kishinev Plant, Moldavia
Kharionovsky, Nikolai Nikolayevich	Pump operator, Sosnogorsk Gas-Processing Plant, Komi Autonomous Republic
Kopanitskaya, Tatyana Valentinovna	Leader, Operators' brigade, Tallinn Electrical Equipment Plant, Estonia
Kucher, Anna Pavlovna	Electrical Assembler, Soroki Experimental Plant, Moldavia

Maiorov, Aleksandr Mikhailovich	First Deputy Commander, Soviet Ground Forces (General of the army)
Masaliyev, Absamat Masaliyevich	First Secretary, Issyk-Kul Province Party Committee, Kirgizia
Muravyov, Ivan Ivanovich	Senior sulfate-pulp digester, Syktyvkar Timber Industry Complex, Komi Autonomous Republic
Muzafarov, Sabir Bakir ogly	Driller, Lenin Petroleum Administration, Azerbaidzhan
Paap, Endel Alfredovich	Leader, Stope miners' brigade, Estonian Shale Production Association, Estonia
Piskunov, Vladimir Venidiktovich	Director, Yakut Diamond Production Association, Yakut Autonomous Republic
Plisov, Viktor Vasilevich	Chairman, Executive Committee, Krasnoyarsk Province Soviet, RSFSR
Rakhimova, Matlubakhon Rasulovna	Collective farmer, Collective farm, Tadzhikistan
Ryakhov, Anatoly Yakovlevich	Commander, Privolga Military District (Colonel general)
Shagazatov, Khabibulla Addumazhitovich	First Secretary, Dzhizak Province Party Committee, Uzbekistan
Shartikova, Raya Ramazanovna	Operator, Zhaik Petroleum Administration, Kazakhstan
Spila, Ignat Eduardovich	Machine operator, Collective Farm, Latvia
Tkachuk, Grigroy Ivanovich	Chairman, Collective Farm Ukraine
Turganbayev, Danebai Tazhenovich	Machine operator, State farm, Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Republic
Vedernikov, Nikolai Ivanovich	Senior operator, Grozny Petroleum Refinery, Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Republic
Voronin, Lev Alekseyevich	First Deputy Chairman, USSR Gosplan (in charge of summary planning)
Yazov, Dmitry Timofeyevich	Commander, Central Asian Military District (General of the Army)
Yegiazaryan, Khazal Manukovna	Collective farmer, Collective farm Armenia
Yeliseyev, Yevgeny Aleksandrovich	First Secretary, Khakass Province Party Committee, RSFSR

100TH CONGRESS
1ST SESSION

H. RES. 283

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that more Members of Congress should travel in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and more Soviet leaders should travel in the United States.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OCTOBER 8, 1987

Miss SCHNEIDER (for herself and Mr. UDALL) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs

---

RESOLUTION

Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that more Members of Congress should travel in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and more Soviet leaders should travel in the United States.

Whereas since 1945 conditions in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the actions of the Soviet Government have influenced the foreign and defense policies of the United States, and conditions in the United States and the actions of the Government of the United States have influenced the foreign and defense policies of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Whereas, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, the Congress participates in the development of the foreign and defense policies of the United States;

Whereas a majority of the current Members of Congress have never traveled in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and few Soviet leaders have ever traveled in the United States;

Whereas Members of Congress who travel in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would receive firsthand knowledge of the Soviet people, the Soviet Government, and the condition of Soviet society, and such knowledge could improve the ability of such Members to consider foreign and defense policies regarding relations between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

Whereas Soviet leaders who travel in the United States would receive firsthand knowledge of the people of the United States, the Government of the United States, and the condition of society in the United States and could develop a better understanding of the United States; and

Whereas increased travel by Members of Congress in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and by Soviet leaders in the United States, could develop into a regular exchange of visits by the leaders of these countries that could further mutual understanding: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the interests of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would be served better if—

(A) more Members of Congress traveled in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

(B) more Soviet leaders traveled in the United States;

(2) Members of Congress who have never traveled in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should travel in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; and

(3) more Soviet leaders should travel in the United States.

Chairman HOYER. Thank you very much for your testimony. I think we've found a breadth of views expressed and I appreciate that.

I'm going to go quickly into questions. I'm going to ask three myself quickly and if the answers could be brief, then Senator DeConcini and Congressman Udall will proceed in the time that we have remaining.

Unfortunately, we're going to conclude this hearing about 11:45, if that's all right.

Congressman, would you like to ask a question first? All right.

Mr. Rhinesmith, first, how do you actually measure the success or failure of a specific United States-Soviet exchange, or do you make such an analysis.

Mr. RHINESMITH. We have not, with the exception of the Chautauqua program in August, where we encouraged the Chautauqua Institution to actually have a questionnaire afterwards which tried to get a sense of what people felt about the exchange, we have not been involved in official measuring of the exchanges.

There were five objectives when our office was established, and they are good objectives but they are very difficult to measure. The first, was to assist in opening a closed society by encouraging people to come out and Americans to go in.

The second, was to help the Soviets to better understand what American life was about.

The third, was to help Americans understand the realities of the Soviet Union.

The fourth, was to establish joint projects.

And the fifth, was to increase the free flow of people, information and ideas.

And against those five objectives we can make some statements but it's not measurement in the exact sense that I think people would like to have; that one can say there were "X" number of attitudes changes on "Y" number of subjects.

Chairman HOYER. Have you had an opportunity to analyze the responses to the Chautauqua questionnaire?

Mr. RHINESMITH. Yes, we've gone through them and basically what we were looking for was the degree to which the Americans who were there felt that they had a better understanding of the Soviet Union as a result of the dialogs and also the degree to which they felt that they understood the issues and the differences between American and Soviet foreign policy.

In the majority of cases, these two objectives were accomplished. But it is still not the kind of indicators that we're looking for in terms of the effects of the exchanges. Especially in citizen exchanges we need more research and that research needs to be taken up by the private sector in particular.

Chairman HOYER. Let me ask you lastly, what do you advise someone who is trying to set up an exchange program with the Soviet Union? Do we have a set of guidelines or do we put out a how-to-book?

Mr. RHINESMITH. No, we don't. We take it case by case and work specifically with those individuals.

Chairman HOYER. Mr. Bennett would be glad to prepare one for you I'm sure. He's good at those how-to-books.

Mr. RHINESMITH. Organizations come to us with a proposal. And what we do first of all is tell them whether we think the proposal is realistic, because many Americans come with ideas that are very complex and unworkable given the nature of the Soviet bureaucracy which deals well with one idea on one exchange. Most Americans see creative exchanges having five or six aspects to them, which really just won't get through the Soviet bureaucracy.

Second, we direct private organizations to the appropriate counterpart in the Soviet bureaucracy whether it's a government ministry or state committee or public organization.

And third, we provide advice to private organizations on policy issues such as: insuring that reciprocity is achieved; questions of human rights; and other issues that we feel that they should be aware of in going into exchanges.

And we also warn them about certain organizations in the Soviet Union that we feel are more propagandistic in their approach to exchanges than others.

In some cases we actually assist them in presenting proposals, either through our Embassy in Moscow or here to the Soviet Embassy in Washington. And then we follow through and troubleshoot on problems that arise in the process. Visas that don't come through, or misunderstandings that may arise. We try to do all that we can to insure that the programs take place.

All of the projects that we become involved in and endorse are subject to guidelines established by an interagency coordinating committee which met extensively last year to ensure that the kinds of programs that we get involved in on behalf of the Government were ones that followed government policy and concerns regarding science and technology transfers, human rights and propaganda and active measures.

Chairman HOYER. Thank you.

Mr. Tsypkin, there was a divergence of opinion or at least of emphasis between you and Mr. Stone, obviously, with respect to what was referred to as equivalency or parallelism. You mentioned that with reference to the ALS and the ABA. Mr. Stone focused on the difference between the Congress of the United States and the Supreme Soviet, which, by the way the Congress as an institution would disagree with Mr. Stone's observations in terms of its power.

I understand his point. The individuals in the Supreme Soviet obviously are individually very powerful within their systems, and to that extent may have higher positions indeed in their society than individual Members of Congress. As institutions, obviously, the Supreme Soviet is not analogous in any way to the Congress of the United States. It meets 4 days a year, as you know, 2 days in the spring and 2 days in the fall, and does not in fact make the laws of the Soviet Union. But, I understand your point.

Mr. Tsypkin, I'd be interested if you could further elaborate on the problems that confront any American institution, which operates in a free society, in its ability to decide whether it's going to the Soviet Union or not. Accepting the premise as true that the Soviet side of exchanges is completely organized, structured, planned, and controlled centrally, does that in and of itself undermine organization-to-organization exchange programs?

Mr. TSYPKIN. No, it does not. As always in any policy it's a matter of a degree, and there is no universal prescription on what to do in every situation.

As for the examples of ABA–ASL exchanges, ASL is a particularly notorious organization, and people who run it, like Mr. Zivs, are particularly notorious in persecuting dissidents and saying vile things about them. They are not just an average Soviet official who here and there has to say something like that.

I lived in the Soviet Union for 26 years and, many times I had to stand up at Komsomel meetings and say things I didn't believe. But I didn't turn myself into a harasser and persecutor of other people, something that Mr. Zivs and quite a few others did; Mr. Zivs made an outstanding career of it.

My suggestions on clearinghouse of information had nothing to do with any sort of McCarthyist tactics, but you have to go into those projects with your eyes open, and I'll cite an example which I have in my written testimony, and I also would like to request the Chairman to enter my written testimony into the record as well.

Senator Paul Simon some time ago suggested a sister-to-sister relationship between American universities and Moscow University as a good idea. Leaving aside the fact that Soviet universities do not pursue academic freedom, something that is valued so much by American universities, Moscow University has been documented by Helsinki Monitors in Moscow to enforce racial discrimination against Jews.

It's one thing to send exchange students there, but do we want Harvard to have a sister-to-sister relationship with Moscow University, and would any American politician like to endorse it and discover in 3 months that he endorsed a relationship with a Soviet institution which discriminates against ethnic groups?

Chairman HOYER. Would that rationale apply to sister cities?

Mr. TSYPKIN. Not really. A city is different. First of all, American universities, and I spent time both at Moscow University and universities in the United States, are very special and very precious things.

And also when a university professor discriminates, actually flunks undesirable minorities on exams, that's one thing and it's very concrete and it's something that gets documented.

In terms of city authorities and what they do, it is much more difficult to—there is less potential for embarrassment there, let's put it that way.

I wouldn't have recommended a sister relationship with Gorki as long as Sakharov was in exile there. That wouldn't have been a very good idea.

So it's a matter of degree, it's a matter of how concrete the problem is, how much embarrassment potential is there, because it doesn't help anybody if we're going into an exchange program like ABA did without knowing what they were doing, ABA really didn't understand very well, from what I know, what they were doing. And then you have embarrassment, then you have criticism. It doesn't help Soviet-American relations. It doesn't help bipartisanship in foreign policy in this country, and that's something we need very, very much.

So you have to look into something, so there is no—I don't see a clearinghouse like that with the potential of any sort of Un-American Activities Committee stuff. We should have our eyes open when we talk to the Soviets.

Let me add something on parliamentary exchanges. As Dr. Stone pointed out correctly, I spent much of my life in the Soviet Union and perhaps I might slip up when it comes to my appreciation of workings of the American political system. But I also, because I lived for 26 years in the Soviet Union, appreciate the great democratic institutions of this country.

Also, I don't live in Washington. I live out there 3,000 miles away, where people don't know that much about the Soviet Union and when they hear about parliamentary exchanges they immediately assume there is a parliament in the Soviet Union. Dr. Stone and I know it's not a parliament, it's the Supreme Soviet, where membership——

Chairman HOYER. Let me just remind you to be careful because two out of the three members that are listening live out in the real world themselves with you. [Laughter.]

Mr. TSYPKIN. So we have to be careful, and I really don't want to see this particular format of exchanges, because the Supreme Soviet is not a parliament and we have this great institution here. We should find another way. Americans are very inventive people, and so are the Soviets when they want something. We could find other conduits for meetings between Soviet elites other than such formal exchanges between the Congress and the Supreme Soviet.

Chairman HOYER. Let me make a suggestion, or give you an observation of my view, and then I want to recognize Senator DeConcini.

I agree with the President of the United States on the issue that democracy is a more vibrant idea than Marxism, Leninism or communism. And one of the views that I have is that in the long run, perhaps not in the short run, but in the long run the greater exposure that idea has by people who understand it, exchanges could be a device by which we can sell a better system.

I don't know whether that's naive but my experience in politics for some 25 years has been that Jefferson was right, that the exposure of good ideas ultimately does make a difference. I view some of this in that context. Now, I want to recognize Senator DeConcini.

Cochairman DECONCINI. Mr. Chairman, let me yield to Congressman Udall for any questions he may have. He has some pending legislation.

Mr. UDALL. Well, I don't think I have too many questions. I'd just like to say I appreciate the enthusiasm in which Chairman Hoyer has gone after this problem and the work that Senator DeConcini has done. We're proud of him in Arizona.

One of the most interesting 2 weeks of my lifetime was 2 years ago when I took a delegation, primarily from the House Interior Committee and 8 or 10 Congressmen, and we went to Siberia. Unlike what was said here today, I used this argument with the Soviets, saying you always come to America and you see New York and Washington and think you've seen America. We go to Leningrad and Moscow and think we understand the Soviet Union. And

there had never been a delegation apparently that had gone in through Siberia and we started out up at Jakutz. Which is about as far north as Alaska. We went through looking at the energy programs, the forests, the oil and gas, a whole range of things in which the Soviet Union and the American people have overlapping interests.

We were guests of what I think would be the environmental protection agency folks and we were talking as we left about getting them to come to Alaska or seeing some of our national parks and wilderness areas and national forests and what we've done.

I guess that's about all I have, those observations. This is a good hearing and a good step forward and you folks out there ought to keep the heat on us, keep doing these things that we want to do but don't have time frequently.

Chairman HOYER. In terms of keeping the heat on us, I'm interested to see Mr. Stone's response and his organization's initiatives regarding the so-called junketeering and why it's not junketeering.

I want to make an observation which I think is particularly timely.

In your statement you observe that "Over and above these reasons"—I'm at page 4 of your statement—"the executive branch prefers, in its heart, that the parliamentarians stay home because it wants to manage foreign policy itself and keep Congress out of any direct touch."

It not only doesn't want us to go there, but when it has people come here it doesn't want them to talk to us. You've noticed that in the last 48 hours, probably.

Senator DeConcini.

Cochairman DECONCINI. Mr. Stone, just so I understand what you're saying, your proposition is that any exchange is better than none? Is that a fair observation? Even if it's with the ABA and a group that is anything but real advocates from the standpoint of what we understand a legal responsibility is of lawyers, or for that matter of the parliamentarians. Is it just the fact that you have one-on-one exchange and see each other and put aside the problems of the institution or the organization.

Mr. STONE. With regard to the exchange of these Congressmen and high officials, I do feel any exchange is better than none.

With regard to the people-to-people exchanges, I agree with Professor Tsypkin that there are a few characters over there that behave so outrageously that any organization might want not to deal with them, as has been done by our organization.

But by and large we do think that an effort to pick and choose would tend to bring down the more desirable factor of having the exchange, and on the whole, we would prefer not to subject the people engaged in the exchange to an even tighter tightrope than they are walking as it is. If they were blamed for not having known or taken into account that somebody they ran into there, or organized the exchange with, had some bad thing in his past, we think the whole exchange process might get so hazardous that people would be reluctant to engage in it, and this might have a chilling effect on the exchanges.

Cochairman DECONCINI. As Mr. Tsypkin has mentioned, just one, the ABA agreement and exchange really troubles me to the extent

I introduced a resolution and got members of the Judiciary Committee to ask the Bar Association to withdraw that particular agreement. They didn't do it, but it really bothers me.

Mr. Rhinesmith, let me ask you, how do you approach the problem of exchanges when the Soviet is so careful and restrictive as to where you can go and who you can see there? It's been my experience that if it were not for the fact that I went on my own on the last trip with the help of the Embassy, but the trips before really on my own, gone out to see Soviet refuseniks. I probably would not have been allowed to see them. I found their addresses, went out in cabs and literally did it without any assistance, in spite of the resistance of the Soviets, being followed and not helped at all by them.

And other Americans that I've indicated, that I've discussed their trips over there, they are very restricted as to where they can go. You have to check in and out of the hotel. If you just want to walk through the park, you might be able to talk to a Soviet citizen, but if you want to go into their stores or into their restaurants and certainly into their homes without knowing one, you just don't get that opportunity.

What do you do with that, take what you get?

Mr. RHINESMITH. It depends on the nature of the exchange. We work with private sector organizations who in turn decide on their own what it is that they ultimately want to do. We provide advice on it.

But one of the areas that we have consistently pressed with the Soviets is home stays; that is, trying to get Americans into Soviet homes. And there's a lot of resistance to that.

But there's been an agreement recently signed between the Friendship Force in Atlanta, Georgia, and the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Friendship Society to have a series of exchanges of 15 groups in each direction over the course of the next 14 months, in which the American groups will in fact have access to Soviet homes.

Cochairman DECONCINI. Again, the agreement you're working out?

Mr. RHINESMITH. Right. And the Soviets coming here will stay in American homes. They'll be here 3 weeks and will stay in three different cities in three different American homes.

Now in terms of getting Soviets into our homes, I think that's extremely useful process, and we've been pushing that very hard.

On the Soviet side, of course, they always have stated that housing conditions don't allow it. The culture is difficult. The laws of the society prohibit people staying overnight in homes. And they have a good network of defensive arguments against homestays.

But we have been making, I think, some progress in gaining access to homes. We have also very much been working on geographical diversity beyond Leningrad and Moscow. We have a program for American high school students in Novosibirsk. They live in dormitories, spread out one student per dormitory.

The Soviet students who come here are not clustered but spread out in different dormitories.

We are encouraging the Soviet public organizations with which we work, the Friendship Society and the Committee of Youth Organizations, to allow Americans to have more say in their itinerary

in the U.S.S.R. and to provide opportunities for open discussion of all issues that Americans might raise.

Cochairman DeConcini. Might not be more liberal?

Mr. Rhinesmith. I'm sorry?

Cochairman DeConcini. Do you find that more liberally granted by the Soviets in the last 6 months?

Mr. Rhinesmith. It has been much better in the last few years. Since Geneva, we have seen a very different kind of Soviet attitude. We deal with the Soviet Embassy almost on a daily basis. I've been to Moscow seven times in the last couple of years for various negotiations. We're constantly talking to Americans who are going to the Soviet Union.

And through all the ups and downs of the political relationship of the last few years, in educational and cultural exchanges, the Soviets have consistently tried to do what they can to open new areas and work in new ways, obviously with their own objectives.

I'm not in any way suggesting that they're not doing it as part of a campaign to be perceived as being more open and less threatening. They are taking the high road in supporting U.S.-Soviet relations. I believe their propaganda objective is to undermine the degree to which people in the United States are willing to support a military buildup in this country, because they're so friendly. And that's an issue we have to deal with as we go along.

Cochairman DeConcini. Mr. Tsypkin, do you think it's advantageous and possible to have American diplomats live within the general community of Moscow, or must they be housed in the traditional European or Western sectors as they are now?

Mr. Tsypkin. In principle it is important as it enables our diplomats to mix as much with the population of the country they're stationed in.

But, at the same time I have to take into consideration that, in many ways it is a harsher post for diplomats and if you have to live with the Soviets, you have to live like the Soviets. And I wouldn't want to impose on families of American diplomats the same living conditions as they of the Soviet citizens. There is a problem actually with visiting, staying in Soviet homes: I mean a normal Soviet home is an apartment where you have barely room for any visitor.

Cochairman DeConcini. I would certainly agree having visited a number of them, that staying there would be difficult. But visiting them is not.

Mr. Tsypkin. Yes.

Cochairman DeConcini. And of course you find them very interested in having you, you know, come for dinner or something like that.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the staff for putting these hearings together. I could go on for some time with them, but I know our time is running short.

Chairman Hoyer. I think we're going to close now. If any of you would like to make a final observation, I'm sure we'd be willing to hear it.

Again, our time is limited, unfortunately, particularly today. It has been a useful hearing.

Let me ask Mr. Rhinesmith one question. Do we keep statistics with respect to the number of exchanges involving persons from the United States travelling to the Soviet Union and vice versa?

Mr. RHINESMITH. We have good statistics for Soviets coming to the United States because that is controlled through the State Department visa process. The statistics are broken down by category.

For example, there were 3,500 Soviets in 1985; approximately 5,000 last year; and we anticipate this year maybe as many as 10,000 Soviets will come to the United States.

We do not have statistics for Americans going to the Soviet Union because, there is no exit visa from this country.

The Soviet estimates of 50,000 to 100,000 are not very helpful. But in 1988, approximately 100,000 Americans may go over there on a wide range of programs.

From a statistical perspective, it varies by field. We monitor eight or nine fields. We know pretty much 100 percent of all the performing arts exchanges. We know virtually all of the fine arts exchanges. We are on top of a lot of the sports and health and professional exchanges.

But, when you begin to get into citizen exchanges, youth exchanges that are nonreciprocal, that go into the area of tourism, then our statistics fall down and we really know maybe 15–20 percent.

The question of maintaining contact with the private sector on a broad basis, providing them with assistance and a better understanding of what they're getting into is critical.

One final comment is that I agree with the other witnesses that the major failing I've found in working with private organizations in the last few years, has been that they are not clear on their objectives. They want to start an exchange with the Soviet Union because they want to have an exchange with the Soviet Union. That's just good. Most of them think that's good, it's a matter of policy.

But I think that we need to be very clear about what it is we want to try to get out of these exchanges and how it is we're going to go about it. Many private sector organizations are not clear and we've been trying to help them.

Chairman HOYER. Mr. Rhinesmith, I've almost neglected, and I'm glad that I didn't. You're aware of the Phyllis Schafley report?

Mr. RHINESMITH. Yes.

Chairman HOYER. September 1987.

Mr. RHINESMITH. Yes, I'm aware.

Chairman HOYER. It makes this statement:

> Unknown to most Americans, the United States has agreed to let the Soviets work with us in the development of curriculum and teaching materials for elementary and secondary school children. The purpose of this agreement is to restructure the education of American children.

It goes on to say that the activities covered under the United States-Soviet educational exchange section of the general agreement signed in Geneva are

> funded and facilitated by the United States Information Agency, using U.S. taxpayer funds, according to Stephen Rhinesmith, Coordinator of the President's United States-Soviet Exchange Initiative.

Prior to that she also said

The agreement calls for Soviets and Americans jointly to develop and test computer software for use in U.S. elementary schools and to restructure the curriculum and teaching methods of our early elementary grades through the use of computers.

Can you comment on that, Mr. Rhinesmith?

Mr. RHINESMITH. Yes. First of all, there are no Government funds involved in this, and I'm not sure exactly where she got that information. We are not involved in funding. My office has no funding.

Chairman HOYER. Is USIA involved do you know?

Mr. RHINESMITH. USIA as far as I know is not involved in funding that at all, no.

The project is being carried out by the Carnegie Corporation, and it is not a project aimed at application of computerization to the U.S. school system. It's a research project between the United States and the Soviet Union on the use of computers in the educational process in elementary and secondary schools.

It was one of six points agreed upon at the Geneva Summit in a joint statement with General Secretary Gorbachev and President Reagan.

In our view, the Carnegie Corporation has really been carrying it out quite responsibly. We have talked to them about it, but it is not something that we are actively engaged in ourselves.

Chairman HOYER. You've read the Schafley report then?

Mr. RHINESMITH. I've seen an advertisement that was put into the Washington Times accusing the Government of facilitating this, but I have not seen an actual copy of the report.

Chairman HOYER. That accusation is in error?

Mr. RHINESMITH. That accusation is in error.

Chairman HOYER. Mr. Rhinesmith, I want—I know you're going to leave pretty soon, but I would like to give you in the time that remains, a copy of this. I'll have the staff give you a copy of it today. I personally think it's outrageous. That's not unique necessarily to this particular view of Ms. Schafley, but I'd like your comments on it. I think it's absolutely in error and I want the administration to review this and to tell me whether the statements are correct and tell this Commission whether they're correct.

Mr. RHINESMITH. We will appreciate that opportunity. Thank you very much.

Chairman HOYER. Thank you very much Mr. Stone, Mr. Tsypkin and Mr. Rhinesmith. We very much appreciate your taking the time to be with us. Your prepared statements will be included in the record.

And I want to say to each one of you, we especially appreciate your interest in furthering what I think the Commission believes to be one of the important aspects of human contacts in the Helsinki Final Act. Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 11:40 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

APPENDIX 1

United States Information Agency

Washington, D.C. 20547

Office of the Director

USIA

DEC 17 1987

December 11, 1987

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your letter of November 17 to Stephen H. Rhinesmith requesting responses to the questions of Congressman Chris Smith as well as your query regarding the Schlafly Report. Dr. Rhinesmith has recently resigned from USIA to pursue opportunities in the private sector, so I am replying on his behalf.

Regarding the Schlafly Report, the enclosed letter from Dr. David Hamburg, President of the Carnegie Corporation in New York, describes clearly the Carnegie project to study the application of computers in elementary education. No federal funds are involved. Also enclosed is a copy of a sample USIA letter responding to inquiries on the same subject.

USIA, through its normal grant procedures, funds certain activities covered under the Program of Cooperation of the General Exchanges Agreement. These include the Fulbright Program, advanced research administered by the International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX), and others. The Agency, through its many offices, including that of the Coordinator for the President's U.S.-Soviet Exchange Initiative and the American Embassy in Moscow, facilitates the activities of private American exchange organizations. It is to these activities that Dr. Rhinesmith referred in the quote in paragraph nine on the first page of the Schlafly Report.

Regarding questions raised by Congressman Christopher Smith:

--With respect to Soviet-US exchanges, especially in scientific and technical fields--those which could have strategic significance--what is the U.S. official policy in assuring that only non-strategic information is presented to the Soviets? (See Richard Perle article)

The Honorable
Steny H. Hoyer
Chairman
Commission on Security and
Cooperation in Europe
House of Representatives

While this question is best addressed to those agencies, such as the Department of State and Department of Defense, which have direct responsibility in these areas, I would offer the following comments. For the most part, USIA contributes to exchanges in cultural and educational fields. In regard to those that do potentially involve scientific and technical fields, such as the Fulbright and IREX programs, very careful interagency procedures are in place to vet all applications by Soviet scholars. We are satisfied that these procedures are carefully administered by competent authorities.

--Does the U.S. have any evidence that the Soviets have restricted exchanges, especially cultural exchanges, and prevented dissenters from participating?

The answer is yes. In the main, Soviet exchangees in all fields have proven their loyalty to the system. In the past, open dissenters have not participated in official exchanges. While whole categories of individuals, such as refuseniks, still do not participate in exchanges, there is some evidence that many who could not travel or participate in exchanges in the past have been allowed to do so since the resumption of the General Exchanges Agreement in 1986. I would not want to suggest that the situation has radically changed, but it should be noted that there appears to be some loosening in what had been a very rigid system. For example, the noted Soviet physicist and human rights activist Andrei Sakharov has been allowed to participate in some official meetings in Moscow. American cultural groups, such as sister city organizations and the Baltimore Symphony, among others, include former Soviet citizens in their ranks. These groups have traveled to the Soviet Union without apparent problems. These are significant changes, but it is too early to tell how broad these changes will be. We look forward to the time when Soviet exchangees are chosen on the basis of their professional abilities and not on the basis of their perceived loyalty to the system.

--I have been concerned that American participants, especially the governing bodies such as the US-Soviet Sister Cities Conference, have consciously refrained from addressing controversial issues--the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the egregious violations of human rights by the Soviet authorities. In your opinion, should those involved with exchanges always handle their Soviet counterparts with kid gloves and act as if nothing is out of line in these areas, or should the exchanges be more frank, open, honest and confrontational? (see Seattle Times article)

I share your concerns, but do not believe that most American organizations believe that they should treat Soviet counterparts with kid gloves. While we cannot control the activities of private American organizations, I believe that most have acted responsibly in dealing with Soviet organizations. Most groups seriously involved in exchanges with the Soviet Union have long recognized the need to have their own participants well briefed on current issues and well prepared to explain American policy, even if they individually do not agree with all aspects of that policy.

We have worked closely with Sister Cities organizations on these matters. I am enclosing a copy of a speech Stephen Rhinesmith gave at the Sister Cities meeting you refer to. In it, he clearly articulates our position on the questions of human rights in the context of US-Soviet exchanges. While some of the speakers at the Seattle Conference may have disagreed with his views, we have found both the national organization and individual city organizations, which are the real players in these exchanges, to be quite responsible in their dealings with Soviet counterparts.

We support exchanges which enhance mutual understanding. We have found that exchanges which avoid addressing the difficult questions which separate the two societies not only do not enhance understanding, but often lead to very superficial experiences for the participants. We are actively engaged in helping American organizations brief their groups on the fundamental issues between our two countries.

At the same time, exchanges offer us the opportunity to raise with Soviet citizens these very tough issues--an opportunity which would be impossible without the existence of exchanges.

Thank you for the opportunity to address these issues. There are no simple solutions to many of the questions which have been raised, precisely because the two societies are so different. For those of us who are involved in the exchange field, we are constantly striving to find more effective ways of assuring balance and reciprocity in exchanges as well as making sure that American participants are as well informed as possible.

Sincerely,

Walt Raymond

Walter Raymond, Jr.
Assistant Director

SISTER CITIES INTERNATIONAL SPEECH

STEPHEN H. RHINESMITH

I am very pleased to be here among friends. I have been associated with Sister Cities for many years. When I was President of the American Field Service from 1971-1980, we were involved in bringing together many of the citizen exchange organizations in the U.S. to look at our common objectives and purposes in trying to present America to the rest of the world, and also enable the rest of the world to get to know America. All of you who are here today are involved in that process in some very important ways. What I would like to do today is to talk first about what these exchanges that we are all involved in mean to us and to the world. I would then like to talk about the most difficult exchange relationship that we have today which is the United States and the Soviet Union. First, however, let me trace with you for a few minutes the purposes of these exchange efforts: Sister Cities, People-to-People, American Field Service, Experiment in International Living, and all of the organizations in this country and around the world who try to bring people together.

We all came out of a desire, for many people after the Second World War, for the maintenance of peace. The first objective of these programs in the late forties and early fifties, was to try to help people understand one another and learn about one another's culture and values in a way that would maintain the fragile peace that had been broken so devastatingly by a 2nd World War, and to build, once again, the psychological health of the people of the world and to eliminate the psychological scars which had been created by nations who spent years telling their people that they could not trust one another. Peace was very much on the minds of the people who started the exchange programs after the 2nd World War. During the 1950's, as President Eisenhower in 1955 called together a White House conference to extend the American people's hospitality to other countries, Sister Cities was born, and People-to-People was born; and other programs were born, we went beyond the maintenance of peace to looking for international understanding. Mutual understanding is a second objective of these exchange efforts-- to help one another, to help the U.S. in particularly, to look out around the world to this new world that was developing in a post-war period. At this time, the colonial world was beginning to break down and new independence movements were starting in the late fifties and early sixties In Africa and Asia and other parts of the world, we were beginning to see new countries, countries that many people in the U.S. had never heard of and countries that needed very much new skills for their national development. In the beginning of the 60s, the Partners of the Americas and other exchange programs began to try to provide for other peoples in the world the necessary skills and knowledge for the

national development process. And so the third objective for international exchanges was born in the development and tranfer of technology and skills in order to improve the quality of life of people throughout the world. Through all of this over these years, a fourth and very important objective of these programs has been the personal development of all of us whohave been involved in them. I started in International Exchanges in 1960 as a 17 year-old AFS high school student who went to live with a family in a farming village in Germany. Since 1960 in all of the relationships I've had in the international area, and in all the work I have done with people who have volunteered in international exchanges, I never cease to be amazed by how everyone who is involved in these exchanges seems to grow, learn, develop, change, reach-out, and find out things about themselves every year. I think that is a very important reason why all of you are here today. You have friends that you have made around the world. You have experiences that you have had that have stretched you beyond what you thought you could do. You have learned about yourself and about this country through the eyes of others in ways that have added meaning and insight to your lives. You have done the same for others from many countries. It's that personal aspect of the international process for which Sister Cities and the People-to-People Exchange and the Citizen Exchange movement in this country stand.

It's an extraordinarily important and exhilarating and meaningful work that we are all about. It not only provides education, and skills, and training, and knowledge to people; it provides insight and meaning to people's lives in a world where sometimes we feel that the course of international relations is beyond the grasp of individuals. It gives us a chance to make a contribution to somehow bettering the relations between countries, to providing a fabric and framework in which our own country can conduct its foreign relations and people of the rest of the world can understand us. For those of you from other countries, you serve the same purpose for your country. Through the Sister Cities Program, you enable people from around the world to know your country and its special purposes, goals, values, beliefs, and lifestyles. We are part of a world-wide movement that is not only in this room but also extends to other organizations and to people throughout the world who give their time and energy and commitment to reaching out to others on behalf of their country.

In the course of this movement over the last 30 years, we have seen in volunteer leaders some qualities that I think are part of the bedrock of the values that undergird the work we do together. I would like to highlight a few of those. The first is the identification of common objectives. Whether you are working with Sister Cities or any other organization in this field, there is a common objective, an objective not only to

learn more about one another but also, in a Sister Cities relationship, to try to learn about one another in ways that help to improve the quality of life in your own community. Second, in addition to common objectives, we look for people with whom we may have collaborative relationships, with whom we can work together in equal partnership, with whom we can feel a sense of sharing in the tasks and responsibilities in a way that creates a respect for one another. Third, we have concentrated in much of our work on dialogue. All of us in this citizen exchange effort are really committed first and foremostly to the belief that dialogue is necessary at all times with all people even with our enemies. We get nowhere if we do not talk with one another. We make no progress if we do not listen. Therein lies a responsibility that each of you have as you lead your own people in your own communities in a dialogue with the people you lead as well as a dialogue with the people in the community with which you are working. A dialogue to look at the differences as well as the similarities, and a dialogue to help people work effectively together. A fourth aspect of leadership in the volunteer exchange effort is trust. We talk a lot about trust in international relations. We talk a lot about our programs as building trust between peoples around the world. Trust is a very fragile and very difficult phenomemon in human relationships. It is an even more difficult issue in international, political relationships. It is an extraordinarily difficult issue in U.S.-Soviet relationships. Trust is somehow an ideal that people have in looking at one another and their relationships which I think people experience in programs like Sister Cities, in reaching out and believing in the capacity and the ability of people from other countries to have common objectives and to have common desires and to build the trust and dependence that results from working together successfully. A fifth characteristic of volunteer leadership in Sister Cities programs that is not talked of much is the ability to manage conflict. There is no important and meaningful relationship which does not have conflict. The Sister City relationships that you have, have their frustrations. They are not talked about too much. We look at the good times and the success, but there is a lot of work, alot of miscommunication, a lot of differences in values, a lot of frustration and sometimes real anger about " why can't they do it our way?" that comes out in the course of a Sister Cities relationship. Managing conflict is an important part in managing any relationship, whether it is the relationship you have with your own people in your community, or whether it's managing the relationship you have with your sister city. We tend to talk a lot about understanding and not much about misunderstanding, but I think the richness of the Sister City relationship and of the work that we are all involved in, comes from learning to manage differences as well as acknowledging

similarities. And finally, a sixth assumption which is really a leadership quality yet it is an assumption we make when we enter into Sister City programs, is that there is an inability of people to act as individuals, to reach out to one another and to establish personal relationships, to travel back and forth to see one another, and to work together in a free and open way to try to build common objectives. I would like to suggest that these six qualities of leadership: common objectives, collaboration, dialogue, trust, the management of conflict, and the free flow of people, are very difficult to apply to the U.S.-Soviet relationship. That is one of the reasons why the U.S.-Soviet exchanges with Sister Cities and with the work that I do in Washington is one of the most painful attempts to understand one another and to reach out to one another that I think that we have in the world today. I would like to take the rest of the time to say a few words about why that is so and what we are trying to do about it.

My office was set up after the Geneva Summit meeting between President Reagan and General Secretary Gorbachev. I was happily ensconced in the private sector with no fancy titles like "Ambassador" and no responsibilities for the U.S.-Soviet relationship. When President Reagan came back from Geneva, there was a decision to establish a new outreach program between the people of the United States and the people of the Soviet Union. He said in a speech to the American people before going to Geneva the following: "Imagine how much good we could accomplish and how the cause of peace would be served if more individuals and families from our respective countries could come to know each other in a personal way." I feel the time is right for us to take bold new steps to open a way for peoples to participate in an unprecedented way in building peace. We could look to increase scholarship programs, to improve language studies, to conduct courses in history, culture, and other subjects, to develop new Sister City relationships (sounds familiar), establish libraries and cultural centers and increase athletic competitions. Such exchanges can build in our societies thousands of coalitions for cooperation and peace. The U.S. and Soviet governments can only do so much. Once they get the ball rolling, they must step out of the way and let people get together to share, enjoy, help, listen and learn from one another. It is not an impossible dream that our children and grandchildren may someday travel freely back and forth between America and the Soviet Union to visit each others homes, work and study together, enjoy and discuss plays, music, and television and pull for teams when they compete. For the last year and a half, it has been my responsibility to work with the American private sector and with the Soviet Government to try to make some of those dreams a reality.

We have made a lot of progress. This has been an unusual time in U.S.-Soviet relations. The month before last, we, for the first time, had a group of Soviet high school students come to the United States and go to high school at Phillips-Andover Academy in Massachusetts. They lived in dormitories for five weeks with American students and went to class with them. We had a group of American students who went to the Novosibirsk Math and Physics Institute in Siberia for eight weeks and lived and learned with Soviet high school students. The Soviet Union has for the last seventy years not been willing to send high school students to the United States. In the last year, they have sent a hundred on different programs. We hope in the next year or two there will be a hundred or two or three or four hundred more. Youth exchanges are important. They are important not only because its a question of building a new generation of leaders who have had experience at a young age in another country, but they are important also, I think especially in the U.S.-Soviet relationship, as some sort of a symbol of trust between the two countries and a certain commitment to a dialogue when parents will allow their children to be sent to a country that is seen to be an enemy or hostile or at least has a history of being competitive with the other country. So we, and the President, have concentrated on getting the Soviets to send high school students to the United States, a very simple, small thing in all of the Superpower negotiations, one that has, however, had a lot of attention in the last year and a half from both sides and which is progressing very well.

The Sister Cities program is another area in which we've been working. I've been to Moscow six times in the last year and a half; I'm going back again next week, and last March on one of my first trips, I met with the Sister Cities Association in Moscow and said that it was the desire of Sister Cities in the U.S. to increase the Sister Cities program. I was told that at that point they were not sure they wanted to do that because of other Sister City relationships they had had up until that point, some of which had been successful, some not, and they weren't sure about how serious the American people were in developing the Sister City relationship. I came back and talked with Tom Gittens and Tom and Dick went over and in the course of the last year, the American people have shown their interest in committment to the point that in May, in Seattle, we had 70 cities represented from around the U.S. who were interested in U.S.-Soviet exchanges. We now have the potential for 32 Sister Cities, up from 6 a year ago. These kinds of programs that expand the dialogue between the U.S. and Soviet Union are extremely important. I can tell you that in a year and a half of seeing Soviets on a weekly basis, through all the ups and downs of the political relationship, all of the nuclear arms discussions, all of the human rights difficulties, all of the hostage taking and the Nick Daniloff situation and

everything else, there has been on both sides a unique and, I think, important and hopeful commitment to continuing the people-to-people expansion of contacts between the two contries. With Glasnost and Perestroika, openness and restructuring, in the Soviet Union, Soviet officials are encouraging their citizens to speak freely about their concerns with Americans in ways that have never happened before. We welcome this as a basic freedom of self-expression that is necessary for people-to-people relations. I would suggest, however, that over the course of the past year and a half we have learned five lessons about responsible dialogue with the Soviet Union which I would like to share with you in closing.

For those of you who are interested in a Sister Cities program with the Soviet Union, regardless of what country you are from because this is not just a U.S. question but for people all over the world who are interested in establishing a relationship with closed societies, there are special and unique challenges to such relationships that need to be considered. First, we have learned that a responsible dialogue with the Soviets must allow both sides to express openly and candidly the issues of concern to them. This is true not only at a governmental level but also at a private level. It means that everyone should be able to talk about their concerns, about the relationship whether it is human rights, or Afghanistan, or some other aspect of Soviet society or whether the Soviets have concerns about our homeless situation, or about other things they raise when they meet with us. In all the time that I have worked with U.S. People-to-People programs over the years, I have heard so many times people talk about what a wonderful joy it is to learn that everyone in the world is the same. I would like to tell you that for me, one of the greatest joys in the world has been learning that everybody in the world is very different in the way they express their sameness. One of the real learnings is learning how to deal with those differences that people have and talking about those differences in ways that will allow us to grow and develop. That is certainly the case with the Soviet Union. So in entering into any Sister City relationships, but particularly one with the Soviet Union, it is important to be frank and honest and open about your concerns as well as to look for the commonality between our people.

Secondly, a responsible dialogue with the Soviets is maintained with a commitment to pressing viewpoints but recognizing that non-negotiable preconditions do not create a dialogue but rather close a dialogue. The Sister Cities program in this country over the last year and a half of trying to expand, has run into a lot of local opposition in many communities. People of special interests groups of all kinds, interested in many different areas, have basically said, as a precondition for establishing a relationship with the Soviet

Union, that the Soviets will have to agree to the following series of demands. I can tell you that that does not work in establishing a Sister City relationship. The Soviets will not do that. They will not enter into a preconditioned relationship. One of the simple reasons, from a human perspective, is that they would like to enter into an equal relationship and they would like to be treated with some respect in that relationship. That is hard to do when people say "I will only enter into a relationship with you if you first will meet certain conditions." There is also national integrity and things we wouldn't do in terms of a series of preconditions before we met or entered into a relationship. So if you have concerns about the Soviet Union, which I would hope that most of you do because I do and most people do, if you have concerns about the way in which they treat their own people, about the way they conduct their foreign policy, about the way the country is moving, I would ask that you would enter into a dialogue about those concerns rather than making your issue a precondition of a dialogue.

Third, responsible dialogue recognizes the competitive nature of the U.S.-Soviet relationship and the responsibility of both sides to protect national security interests while seeking a better understanding in areas of common cooperation. This is the grown-up side of international relations. The grown-up side of international relations is espionage, propaganda, and science and technology transfer. The last two weeks have been an extraordinary time in this country in listening to Oliver North and listening to the Iran-hearings. It has been an extraordinary time from many perspectives. I think it has been extraordinary in terms of the demonstration of the strength of this country, but it's also been an eye-opener and somewhat of an education for many Americans about the other side of international relations, the covert side. You should know that the Soviet Union and many countries like the Soviet Union, have seen Sister City programs and People-to-People programs as part of their foreign policy for many years, as part of their propaganda effort, centrally controlled, managed and organized. I think it is unrealistic for us to go into Sister City relationships with the Soviet Union thinking that there is not a national objective or national policy behind the programs. That doesn't mean that you can't have important programs. It doesn't mean that you can't enjoy your time with the people. It doesn't mean that you can't have important Sister City relationships. It just means you need to keep your eyes open and to think about what is being asked of you and to think about the interests of this country or your own country, whereever you may be from, and understand that there is a responsibility that you have as Americans or as Australians or as people from your own country to reach out but at the same time to look out for your own national interests.

Fourth, a responsible dialogue should work to broaden the number of people from the two socities and the two governments who are participating in the dialogue. We have over the past 20 or 30 years with the Soviets, had a dialogue but it has been confined to the same people all the time. We have, in the past year and a half, tried to broaden the volume of the people, the types of people, the age groups involved, the professions involved, the backgrounds involved, and the geographical territories involved. That is one of the reasons we are excited about the Sister Cities program because it gets the Soviets away from New York, San Franscisco and Washington to see what America is about, all the other cities that you represent in this room. Likewise, in the Soviet Union, it gets Americans out of Lenigrad and Moscow to see the diversity that exists in the Soviet Union.

Finally, the fifth lesson I would suggest, is that a responsible dialogue does not retreat to either end of the dichotomy of the U.S.-Soviet relationship on any of a range of issues, but tries to walk down the middle. Let me explain what I mean by that. You remember I said that volunteer leadership is built on common objectives, collaboration, trust, dialogue, conflict resolution, and understanding of other cultures. It is very easy to believe that you should trust everyone. It is equally easy to believe that you must mistrust everyone. It is very difficult to figure out who you must trust and who you must mistrust. It is very easy to believe that you should talk to everybody or it is very easy to believe that you should talk to nobody. It is very hard to figure out whom to talk to. It is very easy to believe that all the Soviets are cooperative; it is very easy to believe that they are all competitive. It is very hard to figure out which is which. It is very easy to say that the Soviet Union has its own culture and its own system and that they should be allowed to live in peace. It is very easy to say that human rights is a major moral, international, ethical concern that has to be presented at every point to the Soviets regardless of dialogue. It is very hard to figure out when it is appropriate. The pain and difficulty of U.S.-Soviet people-to-people relations is not knowing that everything is one way or the other way. It's being suspicious and hopeful; it's wanting to love and knowing that it may have to wait; it's being realistic and being idealistic; and it's being able to take a lot of criticism from a lot of people who will criticize you for reaching out to people that they are not trustful of. But I can tell you that it is probably one of the most growthful, important, significant experiences you can have in your life.

For all of you who have, for these many years, given so much to Sister Cities, I would invite you to try one with the Soviet Union sometime for your own understanding of the reality and difficulty and pain of international politics as well as for your own personal development. I have done it for the last year and a half. After 25 years of dealing with 60 countries, I have found it an enormously personally rewarding experience. We have years to go to have a relationship anywhere near what it is with many people that we enjoy a warm, collaborative relationship, but we have to start somewhere and starting with each of you is about as good as anywhere one can start because you have the interest and commitment, the experience and the skills, to work toward a better world. And for that we thank you very much.

Carnegie Corporation of New York

437 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022 • (212) 371-3200

David A. Hamburg, M.D.
President

October 2, 1987

Mr. Greg Guroff
United States Information Agency
301 4th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20547

Dear Greg:

This is in response to your inquiry about Carnegie Corporation's interest in a study by U. S. and Soviet scholars on the use of computers to improve elementary education, particularly in mathematics and science. I want to emphasize that the research is on the way that computers enhance learning in general in these subjects, and not on the content of the curriculum. Our involvement in this modest project comes about both from our concern with improving American competitiveness, and in finding ways to be involved in productive scholarly exchanges with the Soviet Union.

In June 1984, President Reagan gave his strong endorsement of efforts to establish better communication between American scholars and their counterparts in the Soviet Union. I attended the Conference on U.S.-Soviet Exchanges held at the Smithsonian Institution where he made the remarks. He fully acknowledged the difficulty of having mutually beneficial contacts with a closed society, but he differentiated between actions of the Soviet government and contact with Soviet citizens. He expressed his belief that broadened contact aimed at solving common problems was in the interest of both countries.

About a year later, representatives of Carnegie Corporation began to discuss with officials of the Soviet Academy of Sciences mutual interests in the application of computers in elementary education. These discussions proceeded with the advice and encouragement of responsible officials in the Reagan administration concerned with U.S.-Soviet relations. A modest agreement was undertaken to bring about discussions between a few American scholars and a few Soviet scholars to determine whether an area of mutual benefit might be identified.

At about the same time, at the Reagan-Gorbachev summit meeting in Geneva, the two leaders agreed to extensive expansion of educational and other exchanges. No one at Carnegie had any role whatsoever in the negotiations that led to the broad intergovernmental agreement on scientific, scholarly, and cultural exchanges.

The Carnegie-Academy groups have carefully explored possible areas of mutual benefit that would result from a small exchange of experts who are interested in studying the use of computers in education. American experts in mathematics and science education believe that Soviet research on how to teach these subjects in the early years of education has some very interesting features. The deep concern in this country about the inadequacy of mathematics and science education requires that we try to understand how other countries, including Japan and the Soviet Union, might use computers to eliminate some of these deficiencies.

I share the national and indeed worldwide concern about the historically repressive and expansionist nature of the Soviet regime. We have therefore proceeded with great care in our bargaining on the method of carrying out this project to insure that the U.S. will gain substantially. No government funding is involved. Necessary support for the American participants is provided by the Carnegie Corporation.

The continuing work on the project is the responsibility of scientists at the University of California, San Diego, in collaboration with other U.S. academic institutions. It complements other activities in education being organized by the National Academy of Education under an agreement with the Soviet Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. The project is completely open to public scrutiny and the results of the research will be published in scientific journals.

Carnegie Corporation's long-standing interest in using electronic technology to improve education is most visible to the American public through its role in the establishment of the Children's Television Workshop and the development of "Sesame Street". In recent years, as the Corporation has become concerned with the role of education in assuring the future competitiveness of the American economy, this interest has intensified. We are especially active in the field of science education.

The need to improve American teaching of science and mathematics beginning in the elementary grades is widely acknowledged: evidence that U.S. performance in these areas is weaker than that of its primary economic competitors is accumulating. It is increasingly clear that the ability of our people to grasp new technology and master new subject matter will be a critical factor in the future success of the U.S. economy. Under these circumstances, American scientists stand to gain much from contact with experts from many nations so that we can benefit from the world's experience.

This project should increase our understanding of the way computers may be used in education in the Soviet Union, and will inform individual Russians on how Americans use computers to enhance the knowledge and freedom of American elementary school students. We agree with President Reagan's belief that contact with American people and exposure to American society is likely to have a constructive impact on the Soviet people. Widespread distribution of personal computers and copying machines might become a liberating experience in the Soviet Union. It will be interesting to see whether the Soviet government will permit such changes to occur.

We appreciate your interest and hope this clarifies the nature of the project.

Sincerely yours,

David A. Hamburg, M.D.
President
Carnegie Corporation of New York

The
Phyllis Schlafly Report

VOL. 21, NO. 2, SECTION 2 | BOX 618, ALTON, ILLINOIS 62002 | SEPTEMBER, 1987

Will We Let the Soviets Teach Our Schoolchildren?

Unknown to most Americans, the United States has agreed to let the Soviets work with us in the development of curricula and teaching materials for elementary and secondary schoolchildren. The purpose of this agreement is to restructure the education of American children.

Chapter I of this on-going saga took place in Moscow on October 24-29, 1985 when the Carnegie Corporation, with the prior approval of the U.S. Department of State and National Security advisers, entered into negotiations to work with the Soviets in the development of curricula and teaching materials for elementary and secondary schoolchildren.

Impossible? Far-fetched? Way out? No, that's exactly what has happened. It's a scandal that is crying out to be investigated.

According to a statement issued by the Acting Deputy Director for Public Affairs of the U.S. Department of Education on February 27, 1986, the State Department "apparently determined that it would be more appropriate for a non-federal organization, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, to represent the United States in the exchange."

Carnegie was represented by Dr. David A. Hamburg, a psychiatrist and president of the Carnegie Corporation, who in an interview in the *Los Angeles Times* of June 12, 1987 stressed "the special position of privately endowed foundations that can operate in areas government may prefer to avoid." The Soviets were represented by Yevgeny P. Velikhov, a vice president of the Soviet Academy of Sciences and a frequent adviser to Soviet boss Gorbachev.

Discussions resulted in an agreement two weeks later that was signed by the Carnegie Corporation with the Soviet Institute of Informatics. The agreement calls for the Soviets and the Americans jointly to develop and test computer software for use in U.S. elementary schools, and to restructure the curriculum and teaching methods of our early elementary grades through the use of computers.

This agreement is ambitious and wide reaching. It also covers bringing Soviet experts here to observe our use of computers in schools and universities, evaluating the training of teachers in the use of computers, and conducting Soviet-American joint experiments.

Chapter II of the saga took place at the Geneva Conference on November 21, 1985 when Secretary of State George Shultz signed a 41-page General Agreement with the Soviet Government covering a broad range of exchanges and cooperative projects in the education, scientific and cultural fields. The *Washington Post* of November 26, 1985 quoted the agreement as calling for "cooperation in the development of educational exchanges and software for elementary and secondary school instruction."

The activities covered under the U.S./Soviet educational exchange section of the General Agreement, signed at Geneva, are "funded and facilitated by the United States Information Agency (U.S.I.A.)" — using U.S. taxpayer funds — according to Stephen Rhinesmith, Coordinator of the President's U.S./Soviet-Exchange Initiative.

The Carnegie Corporation, a longtime and notorious advocate of disarmament and "world interdependence," is using its tax-exempt status to cover the costs of its separate, but related educational exchange agreement with the Soviet Union.

Although sensational in content and effect, the meager publicity surrounding these two agreements suggests that secrecy may have been the intent of those involved. Most of the documentation on the Carnegie agreement is found in one lone *New York Times* article by Fred M. Hechinger dated December 10, 1985 (published two weeks after the Geneva conference). Mr. Hechinger's credibility cannot be disputed since he is the chief education reporter for the *New York Times*, a trustee of the Carnegie Corporation, and served as a delegate to the Moscow meeting.

Controlling Curricula Through Tests

As soon as the ink was dry on these agreements, Carnegie began promoting a plan for the national certification of teachers. Certification has heretofore always been the responsibility of state and local officials. The *New York Times* article did not mention this new Carnegie plan, but the relationship between Carnegie's agreement with the Soviets to restructure American education, and Carnegie's role in the national certification of the teachers who will participate in the "restructured" education system is obvious.

The nationally certified teachers will be required to teach to a much-enlarged national test prepared by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) which, interestingly enough, got off the ground in 1964 with the help of a

large grant from the same Carnegie Corporation. NAEP, a federally- and foundation-funded project has for the past 20 years tested a nationally representative sample of schoolchildren in academic and values/attitudes areas.

NAEP is presently seeking an expansion of its budget from $4 million to $26 million a year (more-than-sixfold) in order to vastly increase not only the numbers of children tested but also the number of subject areas tested.

The Nation's Report Card, a lengthy report on NAEP, prepared by a Study Group chaired by former Governor of Tennessee Lamar Alexander, recognized that "there has long been a concern that any sort of nationwide assessment program would somehow generate a single national curriculum for all schools and all schoolchildren—something that many Americans would find objectionable." But, the Study Group gratuitously (and falsely) concluded, "many of these concerns are less important now than they were previously."

Translated from education jargon, that means that the education bureaucracy hopes that the well-publicized news about declining test scores and our millions of functional illiterates has convinced the American people of the necessity for the Federal Government to play the central role in American education. This implies federal control of technology not only to teach students what the government decides are essential subjects and values, but to use technology to "manage" education through the massive collection of data not only on academic achievement, but also on students', parents', and teachers' personal habits, traits, and values.

Such privacy-invading data collection will aid in the continuing redesign of education programs to accomplish predetermined government goals in academic and value/attitude areas. No longer are the educationists and behavioral psychologists content to survey and report on the objective achievements (or failures) of our public school system: those data are too depressing.

The Lamar Alexander Study Group strongly urged that NAEP "make the evaluation of higher-order thinking a central concern of future assessments," and that "NAEP channel additional resources into developing ways to identify and measure the higher processes of thinking and learning." The Study Group report states that "the development of skilled and flexible thinking does not need to wait upon the mastery of more 'basic' or 'fundamental' skills grounded in rote memorization."

That statement proves that NAEP's goal is to teach "flexible thinking" and value-free decision-making even when the child lacks basic skills such as reading and fundamental knowledge about objective facts. The Study Group report urges NAEP to measure "complex thinking skills" that involve "value judgments of some subtlety." The Study Group report also urges NAEP to survey background information about the pupils and their family and home life, all of which is none of the Federal Government's business.

Such a blatant admission of what NAEP plans to do in the area of higher-order thinking is understandable when one considers Professor Benjamin Bloom's definition of the purpose of education and of good teaching. Bloom, a highly influential figure in U.S. education, says: "The purpose of education is to change the thoughts, feelings and actions of students," and defines good teaching as "challenging the students' fixed beliefs."

NAEP's planned assessment of higher-order thinking or "influential comprehension" will require written informed parental consent under the federal statute called the Pupil Protection Amendment. Parents should request their local school boards and principals to make a public announcement prior to the administration of any state or national assessment.

The expanded NAEP process is skillfully structured to provide a basis for education-policy and curriculum control at the federal level. Local schools will be compelled to conform their curricula to this new national testing, a process that will make local control a thing of the past and dictate a national curriculum in all public schools in America's 15,500 school districts. Speedy passage of legislation to increase funding for NAEP will put the control system in place before the public finds out what the education bureaucracy is up to.

Meanwhile, Carnegie's national teacher certification plan will assure that only teachers willing and able to teach to the expanded NAEP test will be rewarded by certification and merit pay increases.

Good Advice About the Soviets

In our efforts to be realistic rather than starry-eyed about the Soviets, let's examine the words of a man who had first-hand experience with them, a former U.S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union, a career foreign service diplomat who has always been known to be "moderate" in dealing with the Soviets.

Malcolm Toon fits that description; he was even Jimmy Carter's Ambassador to the U.S.S.R. Publicly, Toon is partisanly critical of Ronald Reagan's anti-Communist rhetoric; but among his old classmates he sings a different tune.

In the fall of 1985, Malcolm Toon made a remarkable speech to the 50th class reunion of Hotchkiss School, a prestigious eastern prep school. Fortunately, Toon's candid remarks were reported in the Hotchkiss Alumni Magazine.

"We must recognize the Soviet Union for what it is," Ambassador Toon told the Hotchkiss Alumni, "a ruthless and brutal power." Its leadership is "conspiratorial in nature," and its foreign policy is "inherently aggressive." The Soviets will extend and consolidate their power wherever they think they can do so with impunity, he added.

Toon obviously doesn't believe in the popular academic myth of "moral equivalence" between the two superpowers. Our share of the blame for Soviet relations is "infinitesimal," Toon said, listing incidents of Soviet "misbehavior" as a massive arms buildup, the invasion of Afghanistan, the treatment of Poland and Solidarity, the use of biological warfare, and the shoot-down of the Korean airliner.

When Toon fielded questions after his speech, a student asked whether Toon had anything positive to say about the Soviet Union. Toon paused and then answered, "About the Soviet Union? They have good ballet."

In Afghanistan, the Soviets have loaded toys with explosives so that many Afghan children have had their hands blown off when they picked up the "toys." *That's* how the Soviet Union uses children to serve their goals.

Do we want to cooperate with these "ruthless and brutal" people in developing teaching materials for American schoolchildren?

Cancel Education Agreements

Both agreements (the U.S.-Soviet agreement signed at Geneva, and the Carnegie-Soviet agreement authorized by the U.S. Department of State and signed in Moscow) must be cancelled for the following reasons:

1. Their constitutionality is questionable since education is not mentioned in the U.S. Constitution and thus remains the responsibility of state and local elected officials.

2. The General Education Provisions Act, which covers all U.S. Department of Education activities, prohibits the Federal Government from exercising any "direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration or personnel of any educational institution, school or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system..."

However, the U.S. Department of State, which is responsible for *both* agreements, may not be covered by this provision since State's purpose is to conduct foreign affairs, *not* to involve itself in education. Congress should specifically include the State Department under the prohibitions of the General Education Provisions Act in order to protect Americans from federal and international control of education.

3. The agreements clearly violate the fundamental principle of local control over schools. Unfortunately, local control over school materials and teaching methods has already been significantly reduced due to state-mandated curricula, federally-funded goals and objectives developed at the national level, curricula developed with federal grant monies, and state teacher certification policies, not to mention the proposed Carnegie national teacher certification policy.

4. If it is wrong to privatize foreign policy about aid to the Contras, isn't it just as wrong to privatize education policy which determines what is taught in our public schools? In referring to the Iran-Contra affair, the Committee Chairman, Rep. Lee Hamilton (D-IN), said: "The use of private parties to carry out the high purposes of government makes us the subject of puzzlement and ridicule."

But, Iran-Contragate involves only a few million dollars (only a fraction of one percent of the foreign handouts we dole out legally to foreign governments every year), while the U.S.-Soviet and Carnegie-Soviet agreements involve what 40 million American children are taught in our $170 billion public school system.

The actions of U.S. government employees in encouraging private individuals and foreign officials to send a few million dollars to the Contras in Nicaragua is inconsequential compared to this deal in which State Department personnel authorized the private Carnegie Corporation to negotiate with Soviet officials to develop curricula for American schoolchildren.

How do our elected officials, who have sworn to uphold the U.S. Constitution and who vehemently objected to the use of private parties to support the Nicaraguan Freedom Fighters, feel about Carnegie's agreement with the Soviet Union to develop educational materials and to restructure American education? Have these same Congressmen asked themselves *which* Constitution — the American, the Soviet, or a mixture of both — will be the foundation for curriculum development in the areas of citizenship, moral-related and social science education and in the restructuring of American education?

Some U.S. educators are working openly for an international curriculum. *Education Week* reported in 1986 that Gordon Cawelti, executive director of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, urged representatives of ten western nations and Japan to press for the development of a "world core curriculum."

The opposition of many lawyers to a similar agreement signed by the American Bar Association with the Association of Soviet Lawyers should put us on alert. The Soviet lawyers' association is a KGB-dominated, anti-Semitic Kremlin agency. Harvard law professor Alan Dershowitz called it "the most reprehensible professional organization on the face of the earth." Federal Judge Frank Kaufman called it "similar to or maybe even worse than the Goebbels propaganda ministry" of Hitler's Third Reich. Jewish leader and lawyer Morris Abram stated, "These are not lawyers."

Surely, if lawyers reject negotiations by a private American association with a Soviet government association because of the Soviets' contempt for truth and the law, Americans, who *all* have a stake in the quality of education, should reject the education agreements for the very same reasons plus the outrageous way that the Soviets trample on intellectual freedom and use education for Marxist-Leninist indoctrination.

If ABA lawyers can be taken in by a Soviet agreement and allow themselves to be used by the clever propaganda that ensues, then how in the world are schoolchildren going to protect themselves from curricula and methods developed as a result of these education agreements?

Both agreements call out for an immediate, fully-televised Congressional investigation — with possibly a special prosecutor — to ascertain exactly who is responsible for their planning and implementation.

What You Can Do

1. Write to President Ronald Reagan, The White House, Washington, D.C. 20500, and ask him to cancel all portions of the U.S.-Soviet agreements of November 21, 1985, negotiated by the State Department, which pertain to the development of curricula for elementary and secondary schools. Cancellation raises no legal problems: President Carter cancelled similar cultural, scientific and educational agreements in 1979 when the Soviets invaded Afghanistan. If Jimmy Carter can do it, Ronald Reagan can, too.

2. Write to your Senators at the Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, and your Congressmen at the House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. Ask them to start a fullscale Congressional investigation of the U.S.-Soviet and the Carnegie-Soviet education agreements.

The Phyllis Schlafly Report
Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002
ISSN0556-0152
Published monthly by The Eagle Trust Fund, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002. Second Class Postage Paid at Alton, Illinois. Postmaster: Address Corrections should be sent to the Phyllis Schlafly Report, Box 618, Alton, Illinois 62002.
Subscription Price: $15 per year. Extra copies available: 50 cents each; 4 copies $1; 30 copies $5; 100 copies $10.

APPENDIX 2

Contact: Paul Schicke
(415) 283-7920

ARK COMMUNICATIONS INSTITUTE

Creating an ark as big as the world

A Vision Being Fulfilled:

President Reagan's Pre-Geneva Proposals
on American-Soviet Citizen Exchange
Matched with Subsequent Developments in the Field

prepared by Ark Communications Institute

On November 14, 1985, just prior to the Geneva summit, President Reagan spoke out in favor of expanded citizen exchange between the U.S. and the Soviet Union. Harkening back to the spirit of President Eisenhower, who "recognized that removing the barriers between people is at the heart of our relationship," Mr. Reagan declared that "we can find as yet undiscovered avenues where American and Soviet citizens can cooperate, fruitfully, for the benefit of mankind."[1]

In addressing the American people, Mr. Reagan gave example after example of the kind of avenues he envisioned. They included, but went far beyond, the familiar kind of cultural exchanges involving writers, academics, and performing artists. "For example," said the President, "if Soviet youth could attend American schools and universities, they could learn first-hand what spirit of freedom rules our land..." American youth, while studying in the USSR, "could talk about their interests and values and hopes for the future with their Soviet friends."

On the following pages, we reprint relevant passages from the President's speech,[2] which are then matched, one by one, with examples of subsequent American-Soviet progress in the areas mentioned.[3]

Part of the credit for this progress belongs to Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev. On the American side, the Geneva summit led to creation of the President's US-Soviet Exchange Initiative, ably coordinated by Ambassador Stephen H. Rhinesmith. It should be added, as Mr. Reagan said in his pre-Geneva speech, that

"governments can only do so much: once they get the ball rolling, they should get out of the way and let people get together to share, enjoy, help, listen and learn from each other...." What is so distinctive in American citizen diplomacy, as in our economy, is the decentralized initiative found throughout the society.

In his pre-Geneva speech, the President not only indicated a sensitive awareness of many initiatives already taken, but also encouraged further cooperation between Americans and Soviets. A vision is being fulfilled and the question is, "what next?"

Ark is now preparing a companion report that will include diverse newspaper clippings on citizen diplomacy, a list of coming events in the field, and some suggestions about how national leaders could help to encourage and shape this growing movement.

--CRAIG COMSTOCK, SENIOR ASSOCIATE, ARK COMMUNICATIONS INSTITUTE

1 Speech quotations are taken from the *New York Times*, November 15, 1985.

2 As they appear in a proof copy of *Global Partners: Citizen Exchange in the Soviet Union*, edited and published by Ark Communications Institute (ACI), April 1987.

3 Based upon items compiled, or directly reported, by Paul Schicke of the ACI staff.

81-078 0 - 88 - 4

as reprinted in *Global Partners*

Speech before the Geneva Summit

Lest anyone suppose that citizen diplomacy is associated with the liberal end of America's political spectrum, here are excerpts from the televised speech by Ronald Reagan just before he left for the Geneva summit meeting in November, 1985. Just as waste in the Pentagon is opposed by conservatives who dislike unnecessary spending, by liberals who worry about destabilizing weaponry, and by strategists who want a defense that's effective and not just expensive, so citizen diplomacy appeals to many constituencies. To a conservative, for example, it offers a way for private citizens, acting on their own initiative, to supplement the diplomatic efforts of the government that conservatives, in general, regard with suspicion. In short, grassroots diplomacy exemplifies volunteerism at its most adventurous.

by President Ronald Reagan

Despite our deep and abiding differences, we can and must prevent our international competition from spilling over into violence. We can find as yet undiscovered avenues where American and Soviet citizens can cooperate, fruitfully, for the benefit of mankind.... Enduring peace requires openness, honest communications, and opportunities for our peoples to get to know one another directly.

The United States has always stood for openness. Thirty years ago in Geneva, President Eisenhower, preparing for his first meeting with the then Soviet leader, made his "Open Skies" proposal and an offer of new educational and cultural exchanges with the Soviet Union. He recognized that removing the barriers between people is at the heart of our relationship. He said:

"Restrictions on communications of all kinds, including radio and travel, existing in extreme form in some places, have operated as causes of mutual distrust. In America, the fervent belief in freedom of thought, of expression, and of movement is a vital part of our heritage."

"Imagine how much good we could accomplish, how the cause of peace would be served, if more individuals and families from our respective countries could come to know each other in a personal way."

I have hopes that we can lessen the distrust between us, reduce the levels of secrecy, and bring forth a more open world. Imagine how much good we could accomplish, how the cause of peace would be served, if more individuals and families from our respective countries could come to know each other in a personal way.

For example, if Soviet youth could attend American schools and universities, they could learn firsthand what spirit of freedom rules our land, and that we do not wish the Soviet people any harm. If American youth could do likewise, they could talk about their interests and values and hopes for the future with their Soviet friends. They would get firsthand knowledge of life in the USSR, but most important they would learn that we're all God's children with much in common.

Imagine if people in our nation could see the Bolshoi Ballet again, while Soviet citizens could see American plays and hear groups like the Beach Boys. And how about Soviet children watching "Sesame Street."

We've had educational and cultural exchanges for twenty-five years and are now close to completing a new agreement. But I feel the time is ripe for us to take bold new steps to open the way for our peoples to participate in a unprecedented way in the building of peace.

Why shouldn't I propose to Mr.

Gorbachev at Geneva that we exchange many more of our citizens from fraternal, religious, educational and cultural groups? Why not suggest the exchange of thousands of undergraduates each year, and even younger students who would live with a host family and attend schools or summer camps?

We could look to increase scholarship programs, improve language studies, conduct courses in history, culture, and other subjects, develop new sister cities, establish libraries and yes, increase athletic competition. People of both our nations love sports. If we must compete, let it be on the playing field and not the battlefields.

In science and technology we could launch new joint space ventures and establish joint medical research projects. In communications, we'd like to see more appearances in the other's mass media by representatives of both our countries: if Soviet spokesmen are free to appear on American television, to be published and read in the American press, shouldn't the Soviet people have the same right to see, hear, and read what we Americans have to say?

Such proposals will not bridge our differences, but people-to-people contacts can build genuine constituencies for peace in both countries. After all, people don't start wars, governments do....

We are proposing the broadest people-to-people exchanges in the history of American-Soviet relations, exchanges in sports and cultures, in the media, education, and the arts. Such exchanges can build in our societies thousands of coalitions for cooperation and peace.

Governments can only do so much: once they get the ball rolling, they should get out of the way and let people get together to share, enjoy, help, listen and learn from each other, especially young people.

These remarks are excerpted from the speech that President Reagan delivered on November 14, 1985, the full text of which appeared the next day in the New York Times.

"Imagine how much good we could accomplish, how the cause of peace would be served, if more individuals and families from our respective countries could come to know each other in a personal way..."

* Two hundred and forty Soviets came to upstate New York to attend the third annual Chautauqua Conference on US-Soviet relations, August 23-28, 1987. A highlight of the conference was the hosting of one hundred ninety Soviets with American families. This year's Soviet delegation had a chance to interact with about 2000 attending American participants in a village atmosphere. They enjoyed many informal meetings as well as presentations that included, on the American side, speeches by Senator Bradley, Governor Cuomo, Administration representatives, and a televised speech by President Reagan. The conference was widely reported in the US media. [Surviving Together/New York Times/USIA]

* In September 1987, Friendship Force, located in Atlanta, GA, embarked on a major reciprocal exchange with the Soviet Friendship Society featuring homestays in both countries. One delegation from each of the fifteen Soviet republics will travel to partner states in America each month, while corresponding delegations representing American states will travel to partner republics. The delegation from the Russian Republic will be in Washington, DC from November 10-12, in Iowa November 12-18, in San Francisco November 18-22, and in NYC November 23-25 of 1987. The Iowa committee includes banker John Crystal. According to Friendship Force, Iowa Governor Brandstead will meet the delegation members and travel back with them to the Soviet Union. Iowa is in the early stages of negotiating a sister state trade link with the USSR. [Ark Communications Institute (ACI) & Surviving Together]

* Apart from officials, scientists, and performers, a small number of Soviet citizens have visited the US, as compared with the

number of American grassroots diplomats who have gone to the USSR. Seeking to enlarge the opportunities for unofficial Soviets to experience American life, the Center for US-USSR Initiatives, a San Francisco-based citizen exchange group, has proposed to authorities in Moscow that hundreds of Soviet citizens visit the US in small groups throughout much of 1988. These authorities have agreed to send a total of 400 Soviets, paying their airfare to the point of entry. In a two-week period, each group will be hosted by several American communities. Staying in private homes, the Soviets will meet a cross-section of society. This program is designed to enable Soviet citizens to learn about American life while they talk with Americans about their own experiences in the USSR. A pilot visit by twenty Soviets in January sponsored by the Kellogg Fellows will launch this program. After evaluation of this visit, the main program will begin in the spring of 1988. [ACI]

* The Seattle-based Center for Soviet-American Dialogue is co-sponsoring the first annual "citizen summit" in the Washington, DC area, February 1-5, 1988. Scheduled to take place at the Radisson Park Plaza Hotel and Conference Center, this major conference will include 100 Soviets from many fields who will meet on joint task forces with American citizens. [ACI]

"Imagine if people in our nation could see the Bolshoi Ballet again..."

* The Bolshoi Ballet performed at the New York Metropolitan Opera House, June 30-July 18; the Kennedy Center in Washington, DC, July 21-August 1; and in Los Angeles and San Francisco, August 2- September 1, 1987. [Surviving Together]

* The Kirov and Moscow Ballets, the Moiseyev Dance Company, the Leningrad State Symphony and the Moscow Virtuosi are some of the notable Soviet groups that have toured the United States since January, 1985. [USIA/ACI]

"...while Soviet citizens could see American plays..."

* In December, 1987 American film and theater professionals will travel to the Soviet Union for the first-ever American film festival open to the Soviet public. The event is being jointly sponsored by Film & Theater Diplomacy, a sister organization of Internews, based in San Francisco, CA, and Soviet film and theatrical agencies. Soviet and American artists will collaborate in a workshop on improvisational portrayals, developing characters for a joint theatrical piece that is intended to tour both countries. Actor/director Andre Gregory (*My Dinner With Andre, The Mosquito Coast*) will stay on to work with the Soviets in putting together their side of the performance, if necessary. The Festival will be held in Moscow, December 2-7, then travel to Leningrad on December 8 to resume there from December 9-13. [ACI]

* In 1985, the Moscow Youth Festival supplied the opportunity for The Peace Child Foundation, a Fairfax, Virginia-based organization that promotes a US-Soviet children's play, to mount the first joint production of the show. The night that Soviet TV news ran an item on "Peace Child," its switchboard became jammed with calls requesting a repeat of the piece. Peace child mounted three joint Soviet/American summer programs in 1987, and plans to conduct eight Peace Child performance joint ventures in 1988. Five delegations of twenty American youths will travel to the Soviet Union to join with Soviet members of the cast in a three or four-city tour of the production. Three delegations of ten Soviet performers will join with American cast-members for a tour of from four to six cities in the United States. In both countries the traveling companies will be joined by local children's choruses. [ACI]

* In September 1987 representatives of the US entertainment industry including Kris Kristofferson, *Rocky* films producer

Robert Chartoff, and *Amerika* mini-series producer John Lugar, traveled to Moscow for a conference entitled Soviet-American Images: A New Perspective. The conference was sponsored by the Seattle-based Center for Soviet-American Dialogue and hosted by the Soviet Peace Committee. During the conference, representatives of the Carmel, CA-based Frohman Academy made plans with the Soviet agency Gostconcert to mount a joint production of *Oklahoma!* that is intended to tour both countries. Frohman officials also initiated plans to launch an exchange program between American and Soviet theater students. [ACI]

"...and hear groups like the Beach Boys..."

* American pop music star Billy Joel took Russia by storm when he brought his fully-staged rock show to the Soviet Union under the new US-Soviet cultural agreement. He performed in Moscow on July 26, 27, and 29, and in Leningrad on August 2, 3, and 5, 1987. The HBO *World Stage* premiere of *Billy Joel from Leningrad, USSR* aired on October, 24, 1987. [Time Magazine, USIA]

* In the summer of 1986 Soviet authorities for the first time permitted a Russian rock band, the well-established Stas Namin Group, to tour the United States. [People Magazine]

* To climax the 1987 Leningrad-to-Moscow American/Soviet Walk, rock bands of both nations performed in Moscow at a free July 4th concert produced by impresario Bill Graham. The Doobie Brothers, Bonnie Raitt, Santana, and James Taylor appeared with an equal number of Soviet acts in a six-hour show before 15,000 people at Izmajlovo Stadium in Moscow. In October 1987 the July 4th "Interdependence" concert aired in the United States as a Showtime special called *Rock & Roll Summit.*
A special of the event aired on Soviet TV shortly after the concert took place. [ACI/San Francisco Chronicle 7/6/87]

"...and how about Soviet children watching Sesame Street?"

* Jim Hensen, creator of *Sesame Street* and the *Muppets*, will be among the delegation of film professionals traveling to Moscow in December, 1987 to participate in the *Act One: American Film Festival*; the first American Film Festival ever open to the Soviet public. Hensen will be representing his productions *The Great Muppet Caper* and *Labyrinth*. He will also bring along a documentary on the making of *Labyrinth*. [ACI]

* Fred Rogers, star of the popular American TV kid show *Mister Rogers' Neighborhood*, will be appearing as a guest on the Soviet children's TV show *Good Night Kiddies* later this fall. In exchange, *Good Night Kiddies'* host, Tatyana Vedeneyeva, will enjoy a guest spot on Roger's show in March. [Chicago Tribune]

" Why shouldn't I propose to Mr. Gorbachev at Geneva that we exchange many more of our citizens from fraternal [groups]?"

* In May, 1986 an American Bar Association (ABA) delegation to the Soviet Union had a two-hour conversation with Soviet President Gromyko, discussing human rights and other issues. On June 6, 1987 an ABA panel had a dialogue with a delegation from the Association of Soviet Lawyers (ASL) about the conflict between domestic laws of the Soviet Union and its international commitments. The program was the latest in a series of discussions between the ABA and the ASL on such issues as human rights, criminal justice, environmental concerns, independence of the judiciary, and emigration. [ABA]

* The Massachusetts League of Women Voters and the Washington, DC-based Organization for American and Soviet Exchanges (OASES) are co-sponsoring a "Women in Politics" tour of the Soviet Union, November 6-21, 1987. The program will include meetings with the Soviet Women's Committee and with

other professional and political women in Moscow, Sukhumi, Leningrad, and Novgorod. [Surviving Together]

* As part of its writers exchange, The Esalen Institute Soviet-American Exchange Program, located in San Francisco, will host a delegation from the Soviet Writers Union led by its director Mr. Karpoff, January 9-23, 1988. The six-member delegation will include short story writer Tatiana Tolgtoya, playwright Victor Roseoff, and poet V. Kuprionov. Esalen is arranging for the delegation to meet publishers, writers, and editors in Washington, New York, San Francisco, and Los Angeles. The Writers Union plans to reciprocate by hosting a group of American short story writers in June or July of 1988. The Institute expects to initiate joint publications involving well-known Soviet and American authors. [ACI]

* Ploughshares, located in Seattle, WA, reports that it sent three practicing physicians from Seattle to the Soviet city of Tashkent in September, 1987. The physicians stayed in the homes of their Soviet counterparts, who took them on their hospital rounds. In November of 1987, the Seattle physicians will host their Soviet counterparts to complete the exchange. [ACI]

"..religious [groups]..."

* Six young Soviet Jews will be allowed to study for the rabbinate in the United States with the understanding that they will return to lead Soviet synagogues, according to Rabbi David B. Hollander of Brooklyn, the head of a delegation of Orthodox rabbis who returned in May, 1987 from the Soviet Union. [New York Times 5/24/87]

* Thirteen Russian Orthodox Seminarians visited seminary communities in Washington, DC, Atlanta, Chicago, New York and Boston, November 9 through December 4, 1986 under the

auspices of National Council of Churches of Christ, based in New York City. [ACI]

* In an ongoing exchange between the Russian Orthodox Church and US-USSR Bridges for Peace, headquartered in Norwich, Vermont, fourteen religious leaders from the Soviet Union visited the United States, April 3-17, 1986. Following this, a delegation of fifteen American religious leaders visited the USSR September 18 - October 2, 1986. Bridges' third religious exchange occurred when a sixteen-person delegation of US religious leaders toured the USSR from September 17 to October 1, 1987. This exchange will be completed when a delegation of Soviet religious leaders returns the visit in November of 1988. [ACI]

"..educational [groups]..."

* A growing exchange of lecturers continues under the Fulbright Program administered by USIA and the Council for International Exchange of Scholars. In 1987 thirteen American and fourteen Soviet scholars were exchanged between the two countries. [USIA]

* In a continuing program in cooperation with the Soviet Ministry of Health, the Center for US-USSR Initiatives' special project, Creating A Sober World, sent a delegation to Kiev, Leningrad and Moscow from October 1-15, 1987 to teach the message of sobriety in the USSR. The Center plans to send four additional delegations to the Soviet Union in 1988. These trips are scheduled to take place April 14-28, June 23-July 7, September 18-October 2, and November 6 to 20. [ACI]

* Well-established educational programs in the process of expansion include the Council on International Educational Exchange (CIEE) which annually sends about two hundred American university students of Russian language and area studies programs to Leningrad State University, and the

American Council of Teachers of Russian (ACTR) which sends approximately three hundred undergraduate and graduate students on its summer, semester, and ten-month programs in Moscow [USIA]

* Direct exchanges of scholars between American and Soviet Universities, such as the State University of New York (SUNY) and the University of Missouri with Moscow State University, are growing to include faculty exchanges. The University of California system plans to sign a protocol this year with Leningrad State University for a wide range of exchanges. [USIA]

"...and cultural groups?"

* Held in Los Angeles and New York on March 18-30, 1987, the first "Entertainment Summit" enabled director Elem Klimov (First Secretary for the Association of Soviet Filmmakers) and other distinguished Soviet directors, writers, actors and journalists to meet with American counterparts for the first time. Based on the conviction that the screen should be used as a bridge to connect the US and the Soviet Union rather than a wall to divide them, participants expressed their commitment to professional cooperation between Soviet and American filmmakers, and to the production of films in both countries which represent the authentic character, critical problems, and spiritual hopes of our two nations. The next Entertainment Summit is scheduled to take place in Moscow and Tblisi, January 20-30, 1988. As a result of the Entertainment Summit, the American-Soviet Film Initiative has been established as a non-profit corporation to carry out the programs of the joint venture. [ACI]

* Global Concepts, with headquarters in Dallas, Texas, has arranged a "Thanksgiving Sojourn" to the Soviet Union for November 1987. Half of the thirty members of the delegation are Native Americans who plan to prepare a traditional Native American Thanksgiving dinner for their Soviet hosts in Leningrad. In

September of this year Global Concepts organized a delegation of 24 Top Texas Musicians to tour Moscow, Leningrad and Kiev as the *Texas Music Review*. The trip is intended to be the first in a continuing series. [ACI]

"Why not suggest the exchange of thousands of undergraduates each year..."

* The Citizen Exchange Council (CEC), located in New York City, has begun its University Pairing Project in partnership with the USSR Committee of Youth Organizations and the Soviet Student Council. The undertaking will pair up to twenty American and twenty Soviet universities for short-term student exchanges. Six American-Soviet university pairings have already been established with four more planned later this month. The initial program plans to send one undergraduate delegation of 15 members from each campus to the hosting sister university for a period of two weeks. Visiting Americans will also spend a few days in Moscow and Leningrad while Soviets will spend time in Washington, DC and New York. No dates have been set for the first exchanges. The program anticipates the development of strong ties between sister universities eventually leading to semester-long exchanges of both faculty and students. The program is based on a pilot project initiated by 15 Yale undergraduates in 1984. With advice and logistical assistance from CEC, Yale's project has now completed three years of successful reciprocal exchange with Moscow State University.

Agreed Sister University Pairings are as follows:

1. Yale-Moscow
2. Harvard-Leningrad
3. Stanford-Novosibirsk
4. Williams College-Tbilisi
5. University of Maine-Kharkov
6. Lafayette College-Kishinev [ACI]

* Olin Robison, president of Middlebury College in Vermont, announced in September, 1987 that a consortium of 18 Northeastern colleges has signed up for a program of undergraduate exchanges planned to begin next year with schools and universities throughout the Soviet Union. [Time Magazine]

"...and (why not suggest the exchange) of even younger students who would live with a host family and attend schools..."

* The first academic high school exchange between the United States and the Soviet Union began when eight American youths from Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts studied at the Novosibirsk School of Physics and Mathematics in Siberia and visited Moscow during a five week period, March 15-April 21, 1987. The historic high school exchange continued when eight Soviet youths (ages 16-17) arrived in the US for five weeks at Phillips Academy beginning on September 13th, 1987. [USIA]

* Twenty young Siberians, accompanied by Academician Andrei Ershov from the Computing Center in Novosibersk, came to the US in October, 1986 for a computer education tour of Washington DC and West Coast cities. In the capital the young people received laptop computers from Radio Shack which they used to sign onto PeaceNet, a global electronic bulletin board. In San Francisco the Soviets "phoned home" to their Center in Novosibersk via computer telecommunication. In the Northwest, the Siberians, together with American youth, planted trees in a sister city peace park, visited an Indian reservation, and tried out new software in a computer lab. Throughout their tour, the visitors stayed in American homes. [ACI]

* Moscow's School #20 and the Lakeside School in Seattle have set up a sister school relationship, with pen pals corresponding and competitions being held by telex. In October 1986, ten students

from the Lakeside School pioneered a five-week high school study exchange between the two schools. The ten Lakesiders attended classes at Moscow School #20, partied and played basketball together. A return visit is planned. [Surviving Together]

* The plan of the New York City-based Citizen Exchange Council to provide American secondary schools with Soviet partner schools was accepted on May 6, 1987 in Moscow by the Soviet Committee of Youth Organizations. The plan calls for an ongoing exchange of letters, artwork, essays, books and information, leading to exchanges of students in the future. [ACI]

* Youth Ambassadors, with headquarters in Bellingham, Washington is assisting the town of Median, Iowa with an exchange of 30 students who will travel to Moscow and Leningrad for two weeks in February, 1988. The Median Kiwanis, Rotary, and Mayor's office are all key supporters of the student exchange. In June 1988, 15 to 20 Soviet youths from Moscow will travel to Medina to complete the exchange. [ACI]

"...or summer camps?"

* The YMCA, working with the Soviet Committee of Youth Organizations, hosted six Soviet camp directors early this summer. In Fall 1988 the YMCA will host a group of young Soviet leaders for seminars with alumni of the YMCA's Youth Governors, an organization studying the US legislature. [Surviving Together]

* The Samantha Smith Foundation, based in Manchester, Maine, has announced its 1988 Campership program which will enable Soviet children to attend camps across the United States. [ACI]

* In early Summer, 1987 for the first time in history, Soviet young people came to the US for an outdoor adventure. The US-USSR

Youth Exchange Program, based in San Francisco, California brought twelve Soviets, ages 17-22, to join with twelve American young adults to explore the Rocky Mountains in cooperation with the Colorado Outward Bound School. [Surviving Together]

* In January 1987 General Secretary Gorbachev began the Soviet International Fund for the Survival of Humanity. US/USSR Youth Ambassadors Camp Project, which took place last August with Soviet and American Youth attending a camp in Pereslavl, was the new fund's first project. In July of 1988 the fund will sponsor two more Youth Ambassador camps in Pereslavl, which is near Zagorsk, approximately three hours' drive from Moscow. The first July camp will be for Soviet and American children who are interested in building the camp. The second will focus on a celebration of Soviet and American culture by the youths of the two countries. As part of their camp exchange, Youth Ambassadors will bring six Soviet youths to the United States from Dec 18-24, where they will spend six days in LA and San Diego, and then travel to the Northwest for four days. [ACI]

* Volunteers for Peace has three youth work camps set for the Soviet Union in Summer, 1988. Two will be held near Moscow. Of these one will be an environmental camp. The third camp will be located in Soviet Georgia. The Soviet organization Sputnik will be coordinating the Soviet side of the Georgian camp and one of the Moscow camps while the Bitej organizations located in Budapest, Hungary will be coordinating the third camp. Between 50 and 70 Americans will take part in Soviet camps with other participants being drawn from both Eastern and Western European countries including the Soviet Union. [ACI]

"We could look to increase scholarship programs..."

* The United States Congress has authorized an appropriation that will earmark two million dollars in USIA funds for youth

exchanges between the United States and Soviet Union. On October 20, 1987 the House agreed to a conference with the Senate to work out differences in the bill for subsequent approval by the White House. [ACI]

* Charitable organizations, including the Rockefeller and Carnegie foundations, along with Congress, have contributed more than $20 million in the past four years to help underwrite university programs in Soviet-American relations. [Time Magazine]

"...improve language studies..."

* The American Council of Teachers of Russian reports new developments in the area of in-country language training, language-related teaching and research, and materials development in Russian language during the 1986-87 school year. The ACTR Semester Programs at the Pushkin Institute in Moscow increased from 20 to 45 students per semester, effective with the Spring semester of 1987. In the Spring of 1988, the number of students will increase again, to 70 per semester. The 1987 summer group placed 140 students, graduate students, and teachers in a 7 1/2 week intensive training program in Russian language at the Pushkin Institute. ACTR has also sponsored visits to American universities by Soviet teachers. In 1986 fifteen Soviet English teachers studied for six weeks at Harvard. In 1987 twenty-five Soviet English teachers spent six weeks at the University of Pennsylvania, and in September twelve Soviet Russian teachers began four-month stays at various US universities. [Surviving Together/ACI]

* American Field Service International and the Soviet Ministry of Education have increased the number of teachers involved in their exchanges. During the Fall, 1987 term, ten US teachers from elementary and secondary schools and colleges will teach in special English schools in Moscow and Leningrad and possibly in

the Pedagogical Institute in Kiev. The Americans will teach from late September to late November. [Surviving Together]

"...conduct courses in history, culture, and other subjects..."

* In a move that could revolutionize the teaching of contemporary issues in college classrooms around the world, American and Soviet students will study the history of the arms race in a satellite-linked course that will be co-taught next spring at Tufts University and Moscow State University. The classrooms at Tufts and Moscow State will be linked by live, interactive television four times for two hours each between next February and April. It is the first time a college-level curriculum of this sort will be shared by the United States and the Soviet Union, and the first time classrooms in the two countries will be connected by television via satellite over the course of a semester. [ACI]

"...develop new sister cities..."

* In Seattle in May, Sister Cities International hosted a conference on US/Soviet paired cities. Several US mayors and seven Soviet mayors attended. The keynote address was given by Ambassador Stephen H. Rhinesmith, Coordinator of the President's US-Soviet Exchange Initiative. Twenty-two citizen-initiated US-Soviet Sister City pairings are in the process of being officially recognized. [ACI]

* The Seattle-Tashkent Sister City Committee, Ploughshares, and two Washington state architectural organizations have formally presented a design and model for a "Peace Park" to Seattle's Soviet sister city, Tashkent. The plans and model for the park were developed by twenty Seattle-area landscape architects. The park will be built next summer by a combined crew from Seattle and Tashkent numbering perhaps in the hundreds. The park is to be completed before the US-USSR sister cities

conference scheduled to take place in Tashkent in September 1988. [ACI]

"...establish libraries..."

* In 1899, John S. Billings, the first director of the New York Public Library, agreed to open a Russian department in the library and established contact with several Russian institutions in order to exchange books and materials. Since that time the library's exchange partners in the Soviet Union have grown from the handful in 1899 to sixty-three in 1986. These include public libraries, university libraries and Academy of Sciences libraries from all the Soviet republics.

"...and cultural centers..."

* No items found.

"... and yes, increase athletic competition..."

* Many Soviet delegations participated in sports competitions held in the US last (1986) winter. These events include: Invitational Hockey Tournament, the International Freestyle Competition, Professional Indoor Soccer, Speedskating, the USA/Mobile Indoor Track and Field Championships, the World Figure Skating Competition, and the US Gymnastics Federation. [USIA]

* One hundred and fifty Americans joined Soviet runners for Moscow's Annual International Peace Marathon, August 8, 1987. Athletes United for Peace has announced that American runners will be participating in next years Moscow's 10K run. Sovintersport has approved another "Athletes" program for 100 Soviets and 100 Americans bicycler to tour from Moscow to Leningrad in summer, 1988. [Surviving Together, ACI]

* Athletes United For Peace, based in San Francisco, CA, plans to send a delegation of baseball coaches to the Soviet Union in Summer, 1988 to teach Soviet physical educators "the great American pastime." The Soviet National Federation has proposed that Athletes United for peace send 3-5 baseball coaches over to teach Soviet coaches. [ACI]

* Mir Organization, located in Seattle, WA, will send a delegation of basketball enthusiasts from San Francisco, comprised mainly of underprivileged youths, to the USSR in January 1988 to advance their sport on a 14-day tour of Moscow, Volgagrad, and one other Soviet city to be named. The exchange will bring a group of Soviet players to the United States in 1988. [ACI]

* In April, 1988, a men's and a women's volley ball team will leave from Seattle and Los Angeles to compete with their counterparts in the USSR. The trip is being arranged by Mir Organization, based in Seattle, Washington. [ACI]

* In 1986 Turner Broadcasting sponsored the Goodwill Games, a world-class athletic competition in Moscow. Plans are underway to hold the second event in 1990 in Seattle, a city prominent in citizen-exchange initiatives. [ACI]

"...<u>In science and technology we could launch new joint space ventures</u>..."

* The United States and the Soviet Union signed an accord April 15, 1987 on cooperation in space exploration. The new accord specifies the coordination of national projects in solar system exploration, space astronomy and astrophysics, earth sciences, solar-terrestrial physics and space biology and medicine. Sixteen cooperative projects are described. [Henry Kamm, <u>New York Times</u>]

* At the April 12 founding meeting of the new International Space University at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, representatives from the Soviet Union, China, India, Canada, the European Space Agency and the United States voiced strong support for the idea of a multidisciplined education in space studies that would draw together graduate students from all nations in a single campus, with the site rotating among participating nations. The first session of the International Space University took place at MIT during the Summer of 1987. [New York Times , 4/14/87 /ACI]

"...and establish joint medical projects..."

* The Joint Committee under the US-USSR Agreement for Cooperation in Medical Science and Public Health held its first meeting since 1978 in April, 1987 to review progress in cooperative endeavors including cancer, cardiovascular diseases, artificial heart research, environmental health, arthritis, influenza, and hepatitis, eye diseases, biomedical communication, and the individual scientist exchange program. The meeting was spearheaded by the US Surgeon General's visit to Moscow in October, 1986 and a November visit by the Director of the National Institute of Health. [NIH Report, 2/26/87]

* Medicom '85, a live two-hour satellite television medical conference linking American and Soviet cardiologists, took place on December, 1985 via WORLDNET. [USIA]

* Recognized Soviet and American leaders in fields of psychoneuroendocrinology, behavioral medicine, cancer, AIDS, and addiction research met for five days, from September 27-October 2, 1987, at Esalen Institute, Big Sur, California, to discuss important developments in the field of health promotion. [Surviving Together]

"In communications, we'd like to see more appearances in the other's mass media by representatives of both our countries..."

* On April 25, 1987 the first "Congressbridge" linked members of the United States Congress with representatives of the Supreme Soviet for the first in a series of six dialogues between lawmakers of the two superpowers. The first session, which served as a pilot for the project, was not publicly aired. The second Congressbridge, broadcast on ABC-TV in their *Nightline* time slot with Peter Jennings as US moderator, took place on September 23 and addressed international security. The third bridge, aired on October 14, addressed human rights. The fourth, on November 18, will focus on regional conflicts. Gosteleradio is carrying the proceedings in the Soviet Union. [ACI]

* At the invitation of the Soviet Union and with the encouragement of the United States government, Walter Anderson, the editor of *Parade*, and Vitaly Korotich, the editor of the Soviet magazine *Ogonyok*, visited each other's country. It was agreed beforehand that each would write his impressions of the other's land and that the two articles would be published side-by-side in *Parade* and in *Ogonyok*, an illustrated weekly with a circulation of 1.5 million. This is the first time an American editor's view of the Soviet Union has appeared in a major popular Soviet magazine. Korotich, who has published material previously banned by the authorities, is credited with introducing the idea of investigative reporting to the Soviet press; *Ogonyok* has become its country's most controversial and eagerly sought publication. The Soviet editor's trip to the United States, on which he was accompanied by his wife, included visits to Washington, DC, Knoxville, Chicago, New Orleans and New York. [Parade, 6/21/87]

* On April 8, 1987, a journalism spacebridge between San Francisco and Moscow, "The Role of the Media in Current US-

USSR Relations," with hosts Peter Jennings and Vladimir Posner, was co-produced by the Center for Communications, the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Internews, and Gosteleradio, with downlinks to many American universities. [USIA]

* East meets West in Idaho. In Moscow, appropriately. Yegor Yakovlev, editor-in-chief of the one-million circulation *Moscow* (USSR) *News*, spent a week with the staff of the Moscow *Idahonian*, circulation 8,000, as part of an exchange that sent *Idahonian* reporter Vera White to the Soviet Union until the end of July. [Idaho Statesman, Boise, ID 7/12/87]

"If Soviet spokesmen are free to appear on American television, to be published and read in the American press, shouldn't the Soviet people have the same right to see, hear, and read what we Americans have to say?"

* Phil Donahue conducted two "citizen summits" by spacebridge, linking studios in the United States and the Soviet Union via satellite, in December, 1985 and July, 1986. These two-hour shows were broadcast in one-hour edited versions in the Soviet Union by Gostelradio. In 1987 Donahue took his TV crew to the Soviet Union to tape five shows which were aired February 9-13 in the US. One program on journalism was done by spacebridge, enabling American journalists currently serving as correspondents in the Soviet Union to discuss the media with Soviet journalists serving in the US. In Moscow, Donahue covered such topics as family life, teenagers, Chernobyl, and refusedniks. These programs were also broadcast in the USSR.[Surviving Together /ACI]

* You can write to Moscow. It is now possible for American citizens to address the readers of the Soviet press to offer ideas on how to improve Soviet-American relations. At the Soviet-American conference in Chautauqua, New York in August 1987,

columnist Jack Anderson agreed to turn over his column once a month to Soviet commentator Vladimir Posner in exchange for Soviet newspapers devoting equal space to Americans expressing their views. It will be a free exchange of ideas to promote better understanding. Mail your statements to Jack Anderson, PO Box 2300, Washington, DC 20013. [Jack Anderson Syndicated Column]

* Millions of radio listeners in the United States and the Soviet Union tuned March 20, 1987 to the premiere of "Moscow-New York Live," a six-part series of broadcasts on issues ranging from peace in a nuclear age to stereotypes. The most dramatic feature of the two-hour show was the 25 uncensored minutes open to telephone callers in both superpowers. The program, which had hosts in both cities, was carried by the Pacifica Foundation's WBAI-FM in New York from 3 to 5 pm and relayed to affiliates in Chicago, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Boston, and Houston. Soviet spokesman estimated that 150 million Soviet citizens in 12 time zones would hear the broadcast either live or taped. [Washington Post, 3/20/87]

* Internews, the San Francisco-based organization that is Associate Producer of the Capital-to-Capital spacebridges airing this fall in ABC-TV's *Nightline* slot, is putting together a spacebridge between a family in Philadelphia and a family in Leningrad for the Group W television network program *Evening Magazine*. The US and Soviet families will discuss cultural similarities and differences. A program date has yet to be finalized. [ACI]

APPENDIX 3

Marjorie S. Schkolnick
Aug. 21, 1987

TRADE DEVELOPS SISTER-CITY UNION

There may be a few people in the Trenton, N.J., area unaware that our state capital enjoys a sister-city relationship with the Lenin District of Moscow, but I rather doubt it. Not after we made headlines this summer when Lenin District Chairman Sergei Goryachev and his distinguished delegation visited us and, with Trenton Mayor Arthur J. Holland, signed formal documents in both Russian and English at City Hall. Not after Chairman Goryachev appeared on local radio station WHWH and received a record number of telephone calls on its popular "Law Line" program.

Americans value their family ties, and our new relatives, eagerly embraced, are already sorely missed.

Today, there are 14 sister-city relationships enjoyed by the US and the USSR, but three years ago, in 1984, there was only one (Seattle/Tashkent), and I was not familiar with it.

Newly appointed chairman of the Trenton Division of the Mercer County Chamber of Commerce and owner of Shelmar Imports, Ltd., exclusive US importer of Russian toys and handicrafts, my interest lay in promoting trade between the Soviet Union and American small business, the backbone of our nation's economy. My specific geographical focus was, quite naturally, Trenton, my base of operations for the past 16 years.

With the help of Kirill N. Ivanov, Assistant Vice President of the US-USSR Trade and Economic Council and USSR Chamber of Commerce and Industry representative in the US, I organized a delegation of 16 area business, government, and arts leaders who would travel with me to Moscow and Leningrad in April 1985 to explore mutual interests with our counterparts in the Ministry of Foreign Trade, the City Council of the Mossoviet, and the Ministry of Culture.

Vladislav D. Novozshilov, then Chairman of Lenin District, and I met during the course of our visit and discussed my pursuit of a cooperative venture that would encourage bilateral interests and goals. By the end of our stay, Novozshilov, Trenton Mayor Arthur J. Holland, and I announced an agreement that would provide exchanges extending beyond commerce while enhancing commercial potential. Quite unexpectedly, we had become the proud fathers of sister cities.

On June 6, 1985, Trenton's seven-member City Council headed by President Carmen J. Armenti, joined by Mayor Holland and the city clerk, unanimously approved a resolution "to establish and maintain...a community relationship with the Lenin District of Moscow."

Mayor Holland, who last spring participated in the Seattle, Wa., US-Soviet Sister Cities Conference, declares that sister-city relationships are "an avenue toward the goal of world peace." Rosanne Royer, conference chair, asserts that trade is critical to all peace initiatives because it creates economic dependence.

It seems clear that our efforts have met with approbation for a variety of reasons.

Dance lovers were thrilled when the Kirov troupe included Trenton on their 1986 American/Canadian tour. They eagerly anticipate Thanksgiving Weekend performances by the Moscow Ballet.

Enthusiastic concert-goers applauded the Trenton Sister-City Youth Orchestra when the young musicians from New Jersey played in Moscow schools last April.

Delegates from the 15,000-member National Water Well Association, a professional organization based in Dublin, Ohio, look forward to their October trade mission to Moscow, where they will have the opportunity to share scientific and technological advances with their Soviet

counterparts as both groups continue their struggle against ground-water pollution. According to the association's executive director, Dr. Jay H. Lehr, who holds a Ph.D. in ground-water hydrology from the University of Arizona, American scientists are "eager to learn Soviet techniques for monitoring and assessing ground-water contamination incidence as well as their approaches to restoring the quality of ground water through remedial activities."

I suspect that Mayor Holland is right. When people work to create and preserve, they do not willingly despoil and destroy. The sister-city concept teaches peace through cooperative endeavor.

"We all want the same things," Americans frequently tell me, surprised by the similarities that they have discovered between themselves and Soviet visitors. "We all want love, physical comfort, a sense of accomplishment, and peace--peace for ourselves and our children."

Following the Kirov's 1986 Trenton triumph, I created a self-perpetuating TrenMos Fund that derives income from Soviet-American exchanges. Kirov profits, about $37,000, were equally divided by the Trenton Chamber of Commerce and the fledgling sister-city account, which develops and sustains our exchange program.

On Oct. 16, 1986, I presented $10,000 from the TrenMos Fund to Soviet Consul General Vladimir A. Kuleshov at the Soviet Embassy in Washington, D.C., requesting that the money be used to help victims of the Chernobyl nuclear accident.

This November, Moscow Ballet performances in Trenton will benefit the Greater Trenton Symphony Orchestra and the TrenMos Fund. Press releases inform the public of our sister-city link even as they advertise the dance event.

A number of important new exchanges were proposed during Chairman Goryachev's recent visit. One, allowing managing editor Edward J. Baumeister Jr. of Trenton's daily newspaper, THE TIMES, to spend a month in Moscow as a reporter for MOSCOW NEWS while a journalist with the Soviet weekly performs the same function here, was approved for late fall.

"Every day I look forward to the assignment more," Baumeister told me in August. "I understand the Soviet system is different from ours. It's like a language. You have to understand it on its own terms. Neither country has made it easy to do that, especially for those of us who grew up during the Cold War."

Baumeister, 44, studied Russian for one semester during his senior year of high school and will be tutored intensively prior to his trip. He will write in English and be read in translation.

A student exchange between Trenton State College and Moscow State University and a physician exchange between Mercer Medical Center in Trenton and an institution in Lenin District, Moscow, are considered.

I personally plan commercial joint ventures with the Soviet Union in the areas of fast food, gifts, and packaging.

This is an exciting time for those of us who trade with the USSR. Our interests and goals are met with great enthusiasm at home and abroad.

On July 28, when Chairman Goryachev was a guest on "Law Line," a number of schoolchildren phoned the station to request penpals. Nassau Broadcasting Company president John Morris tells me that so many would-be letter-writers continued to call days later that he introduced a series of public-service announcements touting a Trenton-Lenin District, Moscow, penpal program.

"I just felt the project was worth it," Morris told me, explaining his company's contribution of air time. "The response was tremendous, the Russians were very receptive, and so were we."

Kirill Ivanov assures me that our sister city and cities throughout the Soviet Union reciprocate our interest.

Last July, New York City-based Soviet radio and television correspondent Vladimir Zvyagin taped a documentary depicting a day in the life of Trenton. According to Ivanov, the show, on Soviet TV's "International Panorama," pleased audiences nationwide.

As a businessman, I am tremendously gratified by the growth potential that the Soviet Union affords us today. The head of a family business in Trenton, I am delighted to find myself conducting business with "family" in Moscow as well.

###